TRILÔCHANA PALLAVA
AND
KARIKÂLA CHÔLA

BY

N. VENKATA RAMANAYYA, M.A., Ph.D.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
V. RAMASWAMY SASTRULU & SONS,
292, ESPLANADE,
MADRAS.

1929

PRINTED AT
THE 'VAVILLA' PRESS,
MADRAS.—1929.

TO THE MEMORY OF

My dear brother, N. RAGHAVAIYA

PREFACE

The theme of the following essay has been engaging my attention for the last three or four years. In 1927, I contributed to the Madras Christian College Magazine, two articles which are included in the present volume as appendices. I have made an effort to collate all the information bearing on the subject, available in the Local Records, literature, and inscriptions. If I have succeeded in doing this work, I feel that the trouble I have taken has been rewarded to a very great extent. I am grateful to my friend, Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma for his valuable suggestions and criticisms, and to Mr. Veturi Prabhakara Sastri for drawing my attention to certain sources of information. Any opinions expressed in the book are entirely mine. I tender my hearty thanks to MR. VAVILLA VENKATESWARA SASTRULU, for having generously undertaken to have the book printed in his own press, at his cost.

PURASWALKAM,
August 5, 1929.

N. V. R.

THE TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Trilôchana Pallava and Karikâla Chôla

SECTION 1.

Trilôchana, Trinayana, Trinêtra, or Mukkanti (for all these are synonymous and are the names of a single individual) is a mysterious figure that stalks the stage of the South Indian History. He is said to be a Pallava king (hence his name Kâduvetti) who played a conspicuous part in stemming the tide of the Châlukya invasion from the north. However, it is the opinion of many scholars who devote their time to the study of South Indian History that Trilôchana Pallava was a mythical king[1], and that his achievements do not deserve consideration in serious historical discusssion. Therefore, they ignore Trilôchana altogether in their writings, or mention him only to brand him "as a mythical king of Pallava origin."[2] They attempt to justify their position by adducing the evidence of the following facts, which appears at first sight to be very convincing.

(1) Although several inscriptions refer to Trilôchana Pallava, their evidence cannot be regarded as trustworthy; for they belong to a period considerably posterior to the time at which he is supposed to have lived. So far, no inscriptions of Trilôchana have been discovered; and those that are said to be his are not genuine but forgeries of later ages. (2) The Pallava inscriptions, a good collection of which is available for our investigation, do not even make a passing allusion to his name. (3) Moreover, the name of Trilôchana is

[1] E. I, XI, p. 340. [2] Ibid.

usually associated with the names of two other South Indian kings who should have lived in different ages. In a large number of Eastern Châlukya grants, he is represented as opposing the advance of the Châlukyan adventurer Vijayâditya who was slain in a battle while attempting to establish a principality for himself in the south. Again, Trilôchana is said to have been defeated by the ancient Chôla king Karikâla, who captured Kânchi, annexed a large part of the Pallava territory to his dominions, and reduced his vanquished enemy to the position of a feudatory prince. Trilôchana, therefore, appears to be a contemporary of Vijayâditya and Karikâla. According to the opinion of competent scholars, Vijayâditya lived at the close of the 5th and the commencement of the 6th century A.D. But Tamil writers assign Karikâla to a much earlier date, some going as far back as the 2nd or the 3rd centuary B.C. According to them Karikâla flourished at a time when the Pallava power was not yet established at Kânchi. Trilôchana could not have been a contemporary both of Vijayâditya who lived at the beginning of the 6tn century A.D., and of Karikâla who probably flourished about the commencement of the Christian era. Therefore, he cannot be regarded as a historical character.

The grounds on which the above conclusions are based do not seem to us to be adequate. Many ancient kings are accepted as historical characters although there is no epigraphical evidence to prove their historicity. Kings mentioned in forged inscriptions need not necessarily be regarded as fictitious beings. The genealogies of dynasties reconstructed from inscriptions are not in all cases complete and

satisfactory. It is not reasonable to call persons that are not included in such lists 'mythical rulers.' None of the Pallava inscriptions contain a complete list of the kings belonging to this family. The Kadamba inscriptions[1], mention a few names that do not find a place in the 'reconstructed' genealogies. It is absurd to suppose that such persons are myths. Lastly, the date of Karikâla is not so immutably fixed as to preclude the possibility of his being a contemporary of both Vijayâditya and Trilôchana Pallava. There is much doubt and uncertainty about the date of this monarch. There is, therefore, every reason for reconsidering the problem. We shall now proceed to examine why Trilôchana should be considered an historical character.

SECTION 2.

There is abundant material bearing on the subject that awaits exploitation. It falls under three heads: (1) traditional (2) literary, and (3) epigraphical

(1) *Tradition*:—What we have here termed tradition is a species of history that had grown up for centuries in our villages. All the important villages in South India used to keep an account of their origin and growth. These were known as dandakavilâs or kaifiyats in the Telugu districts. The karṇam or the Village accountant was its custodian. He would record all the important events concerning the village that happened in his time, and pass it on to his successor. It would, thus, grow in bulk from generation to generation, each generation making its own contribution to the history of the village. Thus flourished a species of

[1] Jr. Bom. Br. R. A. S. IX. p. 237 and 238.

historical literature in the villages of South India; but its existence was not even suspected until that famous pioneer of South Indian Epigraphy, Surveyor General Mackenzie detected, collected and systematized it, a century ago. A portion of it consisting of sixty bulky volumes is made available to all students of history. They are a perfect treasure-house of historical knowledge and supply us with information on a variety of topics concerning our villages from the 5th to the 19th century of the Christian era. The epigraphists, whom General Mackenzie employed in his service did their work so thoroughly as to yield complete satisfaction not only to their employer but to the modern investigator. They copied or exploited dandakavilas, obtained kaifiyats from the village officers, and tested their truth by comparing them with the inscriptions which they had copied from the villages. They recorded their opinions in many cases, and never hesitated to reject what they considered valueless. Of course, the local histories contain many legendary tales, and mythological accounts; but fiction can always be seperated from fact, although much caution and power of descrimination is needed in performing the work. The local records can be utilised to enrich our knowledge of the ancient and mediaeval history of South India. We have in our present study availed ourselves to the fullest extent of the valuable information supplied by them.

The schedule A that is appended to this essay has been prepared from the Local Records i.e., the Mackenzie Mss. It furnishes the reader with information on two subjects: (1) The historicity of Trilôchana Pallava or Mukkanṇṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi. (2) The conquest of the Southern

Telugu districts by Karikâla Chóla during the reign of the above.

In the kaifiyats of some villages such as Kôta[1] (Nellore), Chundûr[2], Annavaram[3] (Guntur), Tûmunûru[4], and Châvali[5], the reign of Mahârâja Mukkanti is merely alluded to. The records of certain villages like Upputûru[6], Sankurâtripâdu[7], Kârasâla[8], Inagallu[9], Pêrâla[10], and Vangipuram[11] (all in Guntur district) refer to an immigration of a community of Northern Brahmans from the Gangetic valley at the instance of Trilôchana himself. This information is embedded in legendary matter consisting of stories describing the magical power of the king, and the superiority of the Brahmans in their knowledge of the magical lore. But the Brahman immigration, and the generous hospitality which Trilôchana is said to have extended to the immigrants may be taken as genuine facts of history. The kaifiyat of Nandavaram[12], which describes the circumstances under which the village of Pedamudium in the Cuddapah district was founded, may also be included in this class. It tells us how Mukkanti, while on a visit to Benares, gave a promise to certain Brahmans, to offer them protection during a period of 12 years famine, and how, on their demanding a few years later that he should redeem his promise, he granted them the village of Pedamudium as an agrahâra. Mukkanti Kâduvetti or Trilôchana Pallava had an object in extending his patronage to the Northern Brahmans. He was a Hindu, an ardent devotee of Siva. Jainism and Buddhism were in a flourishing condition, and they appear to have

[1] A 1; [2] A 32; [3] A 34; [4] A 35; [5] A 38; [6] A 18; [7] A 20; [8] A 23; [9] A 26; [10] A 46; [11] A 47; [12] A 16;

been very popular with the masses. Moreover, Saivism was not yet brahmanised. The priests that served in the temples of Siva were Sûdras of the Bhavunda, and the Jangama communities; and the worship of the God was conducted in a manner contrary to the Vedic regulations. Mukkanti expelled the Sûdra priests, abolished non-Vedic rites, and substituted Brahman priests and Vedic ceremonies in their place[13]. It was during the reign of this monarch that the Dravidian faiths were brahmanised, and the country was brought under the influence of the Aryan civilization. For the purpose of brahmanising Saivism and destroying the heretical faiths of the Jainas and the Bauddhas, he required the services of Brahmans. He induced them to migrate to South India, and granted them many villages as agrahâras. The traditional account of the struggle between the Bauddhas and the Jainas on the one hand, and the Brahmans backed up by the king on the other, is preserved in the histories of Santa-Râvur[14] Yêbuti[15], Rêtûr[16], Anantavaram[17], and Kollûru[18] (all in the Guntur district). A few kaifiyats such as Sara[19] (Karnûl), Chaudêśvari-Nandavaram[20] (Cuddapah) Bandar[21] (Krishna), Mandrêdu[22], Kârasâla[23], Môtupalli[24] Pêrâla[25] (all in Guntur) refer to his work as the destroyer of the forests, founder of towns and villages, excavator of tanks and canals, and builder of temples. The kaifiyat of the Palli Community[26], alludes to the struggle between Mukkanti and Karikâla. The latter is spoken of as the successor of the former in the Kaifiyat of Anantavaram[27] (Guntur). Several kaifiyats mention the city

---

[13]A 11; [14]A 17; [15]A 24; [16]A 27; [17]A 33; [18]A 39; [19]A 5; [20]A 16; [21]A 11; [22]A 21; [23]A 23; [24] A 22; [25]A 46; [26]A 15; [27]A 33;

of Dharanicôta (the modern Amarâvati on the Krishna) as his capital. The kaifiyat of Anantavaram[28] tells us that the city of Wârrangal (in the Nizam's dominions) served him as a second capital. We understand from the kaifiyat of Talpagiri[29] (Nellore) that Trilôchana was the son of a Brahman virgin.

Thus, we are able to gather much interesting information from the local records regarding this king. These records are collected from the villages in the districts of Cuddapah, Karnûl, Nellore, Krishna and Guntur. Most of the information, however, is gleaned from the histories of the villages of the Guntur district. As the city of Dharanicôta was Trilôchana's capital, it is only natural that people in this region should remember him for a long time.

If Guntur furnishes us with much information regarding Mukkanti or Trilôchana Pallava, the Ceded districts, especially Cuddapah may be said to do the same about his rival, Karikâla. The kaifiyat of Chittivêl[30] (Cuddapah) alludes to the Chôla invasion of the Ceded Districts, under Karikâla. Several records such as those of Sindavâdi[31] (Bellary), Bommavaram[32], Bêtampalli (Cuddapah)[33] and Anantavaram[34] (Guntur) merely refer to the reign of Karikâla. The histories of Pottapi[35], Siriyavaram[36], Chittivêl[37], Kâmalâpuram[38], Duvvûr[39], Kondûr[40], Vuratûr[41], Kommaddi[42], Lempalle[43], Pushpagiri[44], Brâhmaṇapalli[45], Chadipirêla[46], Pattavirâvi[47], Râvulakolanu[48], Gullamalli[49], (all in Cuddapah), Chandavôlu[50], Yerragudi[51] (Guntûr), Nyâya-

[28] A 33; [29] A 19; [30] A 12; [31] A 6; [32] A4; [33] A42; [34] A38; [35] A9; [36] A3; [37] A12; [38] A13; [39] A9; [40] A14; [41] A40; [42] A41; [43] A 36; [44] A44; [45] A45; [46] A28; [47] A29; [48] A30; [49] A31;

kallu[52], Śiriguppa[53] (Bellary) refer to his activities as a great builder and administrator. The kaifiyats of Nyâyakallu[54], Kondûru[55], Kâmalâpuram[56], Yerragudi[57], Chadipirêla[58], Pattavirâvi[59], Lempalli[60], Vuratûr[61], and Pushpagiri[62] mention certain temples as having been built by Karikâla. The most valuable work for which he is still remembered was the destruction of the forests, the reclamation of the forest land for purposes of cultivation, and the creation of new villages. The records of Chadipirêla[63], Chittivêl[64], and Pottapi[65], describe his work as the destroyer of forests. He appears to have devoted all his energy to important works in a particular locality. During the reign of Karikâla the land that lay between the Pennar in the north, and the Tirumalai in the South was covered with dense forest. This region was denuded of its forest, and a large number of new villages were planted in it; two new provinces the Pottapinâdu and the Pulugulanâdu were created, and added to his newly conquered dominions. The kaifiyat of Râvulakolanu[66] tells us that Karikâla fixed the amount of the annual tax which the ryots of the village had to pay on their lands to the government. He is said the have determined the boundaries of Nyâyakallu[67], and excavated the tank of Brâhmanapalli[68] to feed which he built a dam across a rivulet in the neighbourhood. The sites of certain villages are said to have been covered with forests[69] during his reign. His victory over Mukkanti is mentioned in the kaifiyats of Chandavôlu[70], and Palli

---

50A11; 51A25; 52A7; 53A8; 54A7; 55A14; 56A13; 57A25; 58A28; 59A29; 60A36; 61A40; 62A44; 63A28; 64A12; 65A2; 66A30; 67A7; 68A45; 69A4; 70A11;

community[71]. He is said to have granted many agrahâras to Brahmans.

The foregoing description of the matter pertaining to our subject, contained in the Local Records brings out the following points prominently: (1) Once there flourished a king called Mukkanti or Trilôchana Pallava. He was the son of a Brahman virgin. He was the ruler of all the Telugu districts to the south of the rivers Krishna and Tungabhadra. His capital was Dharaṇikôta. He brought Brahmans from the north for the purpose of introducing Aryan culture into his dominions. (2) He was an enemy of the great Chôla monarch Karikâla who vanquished him in battle, and wrested from him the country corresponding to the modern Ceded Districts. According to the Local Records, therefore, Trilôchana Pallava and Karikâla Chôla were contemporaries.

SECTION 3.

The Local Records, as we noted, speak of Trilóchana and Karikâla as contemporaries and rivals.

Literature, both Tamil and Telugu, although late, throws some light upon the subject under investigation. The literary references give us an idea as to what people in the 10th and the 11th centuries believed as true. The Tamil literary tradition, as it has come down to us, is slightly earlier than the Telugu; but there are strong grounds for suspecting that Tamil writers borrowed a tradition which they found widely current in the Telugu country. It appears, therefore, that the tradition regarding the rivalry of Karikâla and

[71] AI5;

Mukari recorded in the Kalingattu-pparini and other Tamil books, should ultimately be traced to Telugu sources. Now we proceed to examine the tradition as it is preserved in Tamil Literature.

(a) Three Tamil works give us very brief accounts of the circumstances under which a king called Mukari lost his third eye as a consequence of his failure to obey the commands of Karikâla. The earliest work which refers to the episode of Trilôchana is the Kalingattu-pparini of Jayamgondan a poet who lived at the court of Kulôttunga I during the 12th century A. D. The following passage occurs in this poem with reference to Karikâla :

"(He recorded further) how (Karikâlan) directed a portrait to be drawn of Mukari who had not followed (the others) to the Kâvêri, the banks of which were being made by kings themselves who had made obeisance (to him), and how looking at it and saying 'this is a superfluous eye' he rubbed it out here, and (lo!) it was extinguished there."[1]

Ottakûttan who flourished at the court of Kulôttunga II refers to the same incident in his Kulôttunga Sôlan Ula. He speaks of Karikâla as "the Senni (Chôla) who put out the eyes of him who did not come with earth carried on his head for building the banks of the Kâvêri."[2]

Irangêsa Vemba of Śântakavirâyan, a later writer also alludes to the same episode.

---

[1] T.G. Aravamuthan: "The Kâvêri, The Maukharis, and The Sangam Age." P. 14.

[2] I bid P. 17.

" The renowned Chôla put out the eyes of him who did not come to build the banks of the Kâvêri."[1]

Therefore, according to the Tamil literary tradition Karikâla was enraged at the conduct of Mukari, probably a tributary prince, because the latter did not go in person to build the embankments of the Kâvêri. To punish him for his disobedience, Karikâla had a portrait of Mukari drawn, and rubbed off its " superfluous eye", so that Mukari lost his third eye.

The attempt which a recent scholar has made to identify the Mukari of the Kalingattu-pparini with one of the Maukhari kings of Northern India although very ingenious cannot be said to be successful[2]. *There is abundant evidence to show that Mukari is none other than Mukkanti Kâduvetti or Trilôchana Pallava. Trilôchana, as his name indicates, is said to have had three eyes. He was a powerful neighbour of Karikâla. He was commanded by Karikâla to render him personal service by carrying on his head like a common labourer the basket containing earth to build the banks of the Kâvêri. Trilôchana declined to obey this command. Then, Karikâla had an exact likeness of Trilôchana drawn, and rubbed off its third eye, thereby extinguishing his actual third eye.

This story agrees completely in every detail with one narrated by the Tamil writers. They differ only in one respect. Kalingattu-pparini tells us that the king who lost his third eye was known as Mukari, whereas

[1]Aruvamuthan : "The Kaveri &c., P.19.

[2]T,G. Aruvamuthan "The Kaveri &c. P. 19.

*See App. I & II.

according to the other story, his name was Mukkanti Kâduvetti or Trilôchana Pallava. The Telugu Chôla inscriptions, as we shall see, invariably link up the name of Karikâla with that of Trilôchana. Moreover, there are strong reasons for believing that Tamil writers borrowed this story from Telugu sources. These considerations seem to us to be sufficient justification for identifying Mukari with Mukkanti.

The earliest Telugu work which mentions the story of Trilôchana and Karikâla is Pâlkurki Sôma's Panditârâdhya Charita, a poem which is slightly later in date than Jayamgondan's Kalingattu-pparini. The following passage occurs in ch iv of this work :

"There was once a king called Mukkanti Kâduvetti who was born with a third eye, in virtue of his meritorious deeds in a former birth. His devotion to Siva was so great that he was regarded as an incarnation of that god himself. The Chôla king Karikâla whose devotion to the same god was even greater than that of Mukkanti was building the embankments of the Kâvêri. Mukkanti who was commanded by Karikâla to proceed to that river to help him personally in building the embankments, declined to obey the command saying, 'Why should a person endowed with three eyes serve another who has only two eyes?' This was reported to Karikâla, and he was so enraged at his conduct that he resolved to punish him severely. He had an exact likeness of Mukkanti drawn upon the ground in front of him, and with one of his toes, he rubbed off the third eye of the picture. And (lo!) the third eye of Mukkanti

burst out of its socket, and he was humbled. Thereupon, he repaired to the court of the glorious Chôla Emperor who graciousiy restored him his third eye.

The same story is briefly alluded to by Tikkana who flourished at the court of Manumasiddha II, the Telugu Chôla king of Nellore. Tikkana must have been a contemporary of Ottakûttan and Kambar. In his Nirvachana Uttara Râmâyana, he speaks of Karikâla as the king who put out the "forehead-eye" (fâlalôchana) of the Pallava king. Linga Kavi, a poet who lived probably in the 14th century A.D,, gives an elaborate account of this story in his Nava Chôla Charitra, The story of Mukkanti, as we have it in this poem agrees in almost all details with those contained in other works. However, it differs from them in one respect. His surname is said to be Chôla and not Pallava. This must be a mistake of the poet who betrays a tendency to give an extended application to the Chôla surname. Again, miraculous events are said to surround his birth. He was, as we have already noted, born with a third eye. In addition to this, we now learn that he was the son of a virgin. We catch the echoes of these miraculous happenings detailed in the Local Records, and the inscriptions. Their explanation must be deferred for a different occasion.

Mukkanti was, according to Nava Chôla Charitra, the son of a virgin of Kâlahasti (Chittore District) who became pregnant in a miraculous fashion by the grace of the God Siva. She gave birth to a son with three eyes, and named him Mukkanti. When he grew up into manhood, he acquired by the grace of Siva,

dominion over an extensive territory which became prosperous under his beneficent rule. At that time the king of the Chôlas, Karikâla was building the embankments of the Kâvêri to prevent it from inundating the neighbouring country. He sent envoys to the court of Mukkanti whom he commanded to proceed to the banks of the river where he should render manual work like an ordinary labourer. Mukkanti turned out the envoys from his court. They returned to the Chôla capital, and reported to Karikâla what had taken place. Karikâla was so enraged at this conduct of Mukkanti that he repaired immediately to the shrine of his favourite deity Siva, and obtaining his permission pronounced a curse upon Mukkanti as a consequence of which he lost his third eye.

The literary works whose evidence we have cited above are in substantial agreement with one another. They tell us that while building the embankments of the Kâvêri, Karikâla commanded a king called variously Mukari, Mukkanti Kâduvetti, Mukkanti Chôda, and Trilochana Pallava, to render him assistance in doing the work. Mukkanti or Mukari assumed an attitude of defiance towards Karikâla who was probably his own liege-lord. Thereupon Karikâla is said to have humbled the recalcitrant prince by depriving him in a miraculous way, of his third eye. The literary evidence is in close agreement with tradition. It affirms that a king called Mukkanti or Trilôchana Pallava was an historical character, and that he was an enemy of Karikâla, the king of the Chôlas.

SECTION 4.

What has been said above regarding Trilôchana Pallava and his relations with Karikâla is confirmed by the evidence of the inscriptions which range from the 7th to the 13th century A.D. Most of them, however, come from a period subsequent to the 9th century A.D. They belong nearly to half a dozen dynasties, and come from all the Telugu districts to the south of the Krishna and the Tungabhadra rivers. They were issued by kings, fuedatory chiefs, commanders of armies, and private persons. These have been classified and arranged in schedules for convenient reference. The inscriptions that have a bearing upon the subject fall into four definite classes. (1) The grants of Trilôchana Pallava or Mukkanti Kâduvetti which were renewed by later kings. These are included in Schedule B. (2) The inscriptions of the Pallava chiefs who trace their origin to Trilôchana. Vide Schedule C. (3) The inscriptions of people who assert that their ancestors were reciepients of grants of provinces or villages from Trilôchana. They are collected under Schedule D. (4) The large number of Telugu Chôla grants which admit the synchronism of Karikâla and Trilôchana. They are included in Schedule E.

(1) There are five inscriptions that are included in this class. They range from the 7th to the 13th century of the christian era. The earliest of them B1 is a fragmentary inscription of the reign of the Western Châlukya king Vikramâditya I who appears to have been in the Nellore district (to which the present inscription

longs) about A.D. 660.* It purports to be the renewal of a grant of the village of Annavaram, made originally by (Mukkanti) Kâduvetti which however had lapsed sometime before. This is an independent proof of the assertion of Vikramâditya contained in almost all his inscriptions that "for the increase of (his) merit and fame, by his own mouth, (he) confirmed the property of temples and grants of Brahmans that had lapsed in that triad of kingdoms."[1] The next in point of time is the grant B2 of the Eastern Chalukya king Malla Vishnuvardhana (A.D 1179). It is said that the village of Eraru-palli situated in the Guddavâdi vishaya was originally granted as an agrahâra to Brahmans by Trilôchana Pallava or Mukkanti Kâduvetti. As the copper-plates on which the original deed of grant was recorded "were in a worn-out condition," he renwed the grant and had it engraved on new copper-plates which he gave to the descendents of the original donees.

An inscription (B5) of the Kôta chief Kêta (A.D. 1197) furnishes us with much interesting information. According to the inscription (S. I. I. VI No. 228), Kêta renewed the charters of seven agrahâras (1) Guntur (2) Solasalamirru (3) Korchera (4) Vangîpura (5) Inumgallu (6) Upputûr, and (7) Kâremchêdu. which were originally granted to Brahmanas by Mukkanti Kâduvatti. The inscription thus confirms the statement of the Local Records which assert that the villages mentioned above were given as agrahâras to Brahmanas by Trilochana Pallava in honour of the Seven Rishis.

---

*See E. I. IX p. 98.

[1] E. I. IX p. 100.

Another inscription of A.D. 1209 (B3) purports to be the renewal by the Kâkatiya king Ganapati, of the grant of Idupulapâdu made originally by Mukkanti Kâduvetti. The Nandalûr inscription (B4) of the Telugu Chôla king, Manumasiddha II (A.D. 1257) comes under this class. It describes the circumstances under which the king is said to have renewed this grant. The village of Perungandûra was an agrahâra granted to fifty Brahmans in A.D. 801 by Mukkanti Kâduvetti, a descendant of another Mukkanti who gave seventy agrahâras to Brahmans in the neighbourhood of the Tripurântaka Hill. Owing to the outbreak of plague, and political unrest, many Velumas migrated to the village of Perungandûra, where they settled down in the fields belonging to the Brahmans, having previously entered with them into an agreement to pay an annual tax on the lands thus occupied. Soon after a famine of 12 years' duration visited the country, and the Brahmans unable to support life under the conditions scattered themselves in the neighbouring countries. After the termination of the period of famine, they returned to their village; but their rights were no longer recognized. The Velumas declined to pay the tax on the land occupied by them, and the rest of the village escheated to the government. "The Brahmans represented their grievance to King Manumasiddhi who sent for the cultivators of Inumbrôlu, and made an enquiry with the help of the residents of Pâkanâdu."[1] It was decided that the claim of the Brahmans was just, and the old grant of Mukkanti was renewed by the king in S 1179.

---

[1] Rep. of Epi. 1908 AR. 580. 1907.

These five inscriptions speak of an ancient king called Mukkanti Kâduvetti or Trilôchana Pallava. The first fo r are said to be renewals of charters that had been originally granted by him; and the last purports to be the renewal of a grant made by a descendant of his.

(2) The inscriptions of a number of Pallava chiefs who claim to be the descendants of Mukkanti Kâduvetti have been published in various places. They range from the 10th to the 12th centuries A.D. The earliest inscription (C1) belonging to this class comes from Humcha in the Anantapur district. The Nolamba prince Dilîparasa claims to be a descendant of Trinayana Pallava, king of Kânchi. The Nolambas ruled the territory corresponding to the modern Bellary and Anantapur districts, and Hemâvati, the modern Humcha was their capital. An earlier reference to Trilôchana is probably found in the Nandalûr inscription of Manumasiddha (B 4) which we have already noticed. There was a Pallava family at Udayagiri (C 2), another at Darsi (C 7 and 8), a third at Kandukûr (C 9), and a fourth (C 13) at Kangiri in the Nellore district. The Bhîragattas (C 4, 4 a) were ruling portions of Guntur. Another Pallava family was ruling the country round the modern Pushpagiri in the Cudappah district (C 14). All these families trace their origin to Mukkanti Kâduvetti or Trilôchana Pallava. They were governing small principalities in almost every Telugu district to the South of the Krishna and the Tungabhadra from the 10th to the 12th century A.D. The Nolamba-Pallavas appear to be the earliest branch of the Pallava family claiming descent from Trilôchana Pallava. Mangalarasa-Nolambâdhirâja, the founder of the Nolamba dynasty seems to

have flourished in the middle of the 8th century A.D. During this period, certain Pallava chiefs who did not claim Trilôchana as their ancestor were holding sway over certain parts of the Guntur and the Nellore districts. They appear to be the members of another branch of the Pallava family which had no connection with Mukkanti. It must be noted, however, that both these families were essentilly Telugu, and they do not seem to have had anything to do with the Tamil country.

(3) Several records of the 12th and the 13th centuries A. D. throw considerable light upon the history of Trilôchana Pallava. They are the grants of people who obtained an agrahâra or a principality from him. The earliest record of this class is D 7. It records the grant of the village Irlapâḍu by Sômana Preggada, a descendant of Vennayabhaṭṭa Sômayâjin, and minister of Mandabhûpa, lord of Giripaschima dêsa. We understand from this inscription that Vennayabhaṭṭa who was a great pandit vanquished in philosophical or theological desputation, a certain Gauḍabhaṭṭa in the presence of Trilôchana Pallava who having been pleased with his learning, granted him as a mark of his appreciation the village of Mirralûra as an agrahâra.*

Two inscriptions (D1, D2) of the Durjayas of Giripaschima country come next in point of time. They belong to the middle of the 12 century A D. D2

*It may be noted here that the Eastern Châlukya inscriptions mention a Vishnubhatta Sômayâjin who rescued the fugitive queen of Vijayâditya. The term "Venna" is the Prakrit from of "Vishnu". Vishnubhatta Sômayajin who was a contemporary, according to the Châlukya grants, of Trilôchana Pallava appears to be identical with Vennayabhatta Sômayâjin of the Irlapâḍu inscription.

tells us that a Durjaya prince named Buddha served under Trilôchana Pallava, and obtained from him the principality known as the "Three Mârgas of Omgêru". We also understand that this Trilôchana was a king of Kânchi and that he had three eyes. Some additional information is given regarding this Buddha in D1. We learn from this document that 'there were three Durjaya princes who by the strength of their arms conquered Viraja and other places in the country of the Andhras. Then, Trilôchna Pallava who was born of a Brahman virgin, by the grace of Siva, became the king of Kânchi. He started on an expedition of conquest, defeated the three Durjaya princes, and carried them away with him to Kânchi, as prisoners of war. But subsquently he not only set them at liberty, but appointed them as governors to rule the territory which he had coquered in the country of the Andhras. Having thus subdued the three Durjaya chiefs, Trilôchana ruled, from his capital Kânchi, the whole earth girdled by the waves of the ocean. Buddha, the best of the three Durjaya princes having conquered the 'Lord of the Elephants', plundered all his wealth. In his family was born Buddhavarma who promoted the prosperity of Châlukyas. We learn from the other inscriptions of the Durjayas that the second Buddha was a trusted servant of Vishnuvardhana (Kubja), the founder of the Eastern branch of the Châlukya family. "His (Kubja-Vishnu's) servant was Buddha-varman, the ornament of she Chaturdhâbhijana, i.e. of a family belonging to the fourth (sûdra) caste."[1] Kubja Vishṇu ruled Vengi from

[1] E.I. VI P. 278.

A.D. 617 to 634 A.D. and Buddha II must have lived then.

It must be noted in this connection that a Durjaya-Parichchhêdi family was ruling at Viraja in in the 12th century A.D. King Malla, the founder of the dynasty of the chiefs of Velnâḍu, is also said to have assisted Trilôchana Pallava in his wars, and obtained as a reward the 6000 province to the south of the Krishna (D 3). A similar claim is put forward by the Kôṭas of Amarâvati (D 4). The cheifs of Giripaschima, Velnâdu, Amarâvati, and Viraja call themselves Durjayas. The inscription D1 mentions three Durjaya princes whom Trilôchana is said to have conquered. Further, it adds that all the three had been released from captivity, and appointed as governors of provinces in the country of the Andhras. It is probable that the ruling houses of Viraja, Giripaschima, Velanâḍu and Amarâvati were founded by these three Durjaya princes whom Trilôchana had subdued. There appears to be no reason for rejecting the tradition without examining it carefully.

D 5 is a private grant. The donor Annanâmâtya, a minister of the Telugu Chôla king, Nanni Chôḍa of Koṭyadona (Koṇidena), was a descendant of a certain Rudrabhaṭṭa who migrated to South India from Ahichchhatra in the Punjab. Rudrabhaṭṭa received the grant of the agrahâra of Vangipura from Trilôchana Pallava. One of his descendants, Sûryabhaṭṭa obtained the village of Mâraṭûr in the Râṭṭa country from Satyâsraya (Pulakesen II). A brother of the above, Kuppanârya by name, obtained the agrahâra of Krânza from Vishṇuvardhana (Kubja).

The statement that Trilôchana granted a number of agrahâras to the Northern Brahmans is corroborated by the inscriptions of the later Pallava Chiefs who ruled in the Telugu country. They assert that Trilôchana gave Brahmans a large number of cows and 700 agrahâras in the district situated on the eastern side of the Sriparvata. The number of agrâharas is said to be only 70 in the Nandalûr inscription of Manumasiddha II (B 4) mentioned above.[1]

[1]Tradition gives its full support to these statements (A26. A46, 47.). According to one account, Mahârâja Mukkanti "gave 700 agrahâras to Brahmans who imigrated from Kâsi; besides, he gave seven more agrahâras to Seven learned Brahmans in honour of Seven Rishis. Another version of the story (A32) runs thus: "When Mukkanti became king, he destroyed the Jainas, the Buddhas, and the Chârvakas. At his instance, a large number of Brahmans immigrated to, and settled permanently in South India. He gave them 700 agrahâras, and in addition created 7 more in honour of the Seven Rishis. Upputûr was given in honour of Kasyapa; Vangipuram in honour of Atri, Kârambêdu in honour of Bharadwâja, Solasa in honour of Gautama, Guntur in honour of Jamadagni, Inagallu in honour of Vasishtha and Kârasâla in honour of Visvâmitra.

The same tradition is current in all the places mentioned above. Besides these, the name of Trilôchana is closely associated with the agrahâra of Mudivamu (the modern Pedamudium) in the Cudappah district.

'Once, Trilôchana Mahârâja paid a visit to the holy city of Benares for the purpose of bathing in the waters of the river Ganges. A large number of Brahmanas assembled on the occasion recieved alms from the king. While he was destributing, after the bath, the sixteen great dânas, some Brahmans crowded round him, and requested him to give them an agrahâra. There were 108 Brahmans belonging to 18 gôtras, and he gave them an agrahâra at the time of the Uttarâyana Sankranti. He asked them to name the locality in which they would like to have the land, and they pointed to the region in the neighbourhood of the Sriparvata. He brought them with him, and in the centre of his kingdom, to the west of the shrine of Ahôbala, in the Nallamalais, an offshoot of Sriparvata, he had the forest cleared to the extent of twenty miles and founded a new village where he built houses for Brahmanas and temples for gods, and planted groves of fruit trees. The village was then given to the Brahmans. It had two streets one of which was higher in level than the other. The Upper street in which stood the temple of Mukkantîsvara

It is interesting to note that Trilôchana induced some sûdras to accompany the Brahmans from the same region. The donor of D 6, a certain Muppananâyaka claims to be the descendant of one of the sûdra families which immigrated to South India at the instance of Trilôchana Pallava. It is said that the sûdra families were settled in the country extending eastwards from the Srîparvata.

(4). Three classes of inscriptions have been noticed so far. They mention the existence of a king called Trilôchana Pallava who was the ruler of an extensive territory on the East Coast. We shall now take up for consideration, an important class of inscriptions belonging to the various Chôḷa families that ruled in the Telugu country. The Telugu Chôḷas trace their origin to the ancient Tamil king Karikâla who built the embankments of the river Kâvêri. Nearly forty Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions are included in the schedule E, and the list is by no means exhaustive. They range from the 10th to the 13th century A. D., and are found all over the Southern Telugu country It must be noted that there were several Telugu Chôḷa families ruling small principalities in different parts of the Telugu country. However, they appear to have scattered themselves in all directions from one centre, Pottapi in the Cudappah district, which is said to have been conquered by Karikâla himself.[1] All the Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions

(the temple is still in existence) was known as Trilôchanapura, and the lower containing the shrine of Mridâni was called Mridânîya. In course of time, Trilôchanapura was ruined by a dust storm, and the inhabitants migrated to Mridânîya. Therefore, the agrahara came to be known as Mridânîya which was corrupted into Mudivêmu.

[1] A2.

commence with the historical introduction, 'Charaṇa sarôruha vihita vilôchana Trilôchana pramukhâkhila pṛidhvîsvara kârita Kâvêritîra Karıkâla kula ratna pradîpa," which means "the jewelled-lamp (that illumines) the family of Karikâla meditating on whose lotus feet Trilôchana and other kings constructed the embankments of the Kâvêri." This allusion is explained in some of the inscriptions[1] by a story: Karikâla who was building the flood-banks of the Kâvêri issued a command to all the kings that they should proceed to the Kâvêri, for the purpose of helping him in his work. Trilôchana Pallava one of the kings thus commanded refused to obey the order. Karikâla punished him by extinguishing his third eye."

In the historical introduction with which the Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions begin, two points call for attention. They assume, like the inscriptions of B, C, and D classes that (1) a king called Trilôchana Pallava ruled the Telugu country before their time; and (2) he was a contemporary of the Chôḷa king who built the flood-banks of the Kâvêri.

The four classes of inscriptions that are noticed above show a wonderful agreement on the question of the historicity of Trilôchana Pallava. Most of them (the Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions) declare that he was an enemy of Karikâla. They do not come from a single locality. They are found scattered all over the Telugu districts to the South of the Krishna. They belong to different ages ranging from the 7th to the 13th century A. D. Moreover, they belong to half a dozen royal

---

[1] E29.

families (the Nolambas, the Telugu Chôḷas, the Châḷukyas, the Durjayas, the Pallavas etc.,) which ruled in the Telugu Country. They agree with tradition and literature in declaring that Trilôchana Pallava was not only an historical character but a contemporary of Karikâla. The evidence at our disposal is so very overwhelming that we have to accept the historicity of Trilôchana, and his contemporaneity with Karikâla as genuine historical facts.

SECTION 5.

Some writers are inclined to doubt the genuineness of the tradition that lies embedded in the Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions. We shall now proceed to examine this tradition in order to discover whether and how far it is reliable. Several Telugu Chôḷa grants contain long genealogical accounts of the different Chôḷa families. A comprehensive genealogical table of all the Telugu Chôḷa families is given on p. 16 part II of the Madras Epigraphical Report for 1900 A. D. Two observations must be made regarding this table: (1) The Telugu Chôḷas have no connection whatsoever with the famous dynasty founded by Vijayâlaya (2). There is a break in the table so that it falls into two well-defined sections. The break occurs after Karikâla II and Dasavarman the respective founders of the two branches of the Telugu Chôḷa family. A question may naturally be raised whether the Andhra Chôḷa genealogy is correct, and if so, to what extent. The answer is simple. It is completely historical, and its genuineness can be tested. The existence of the Chôḷa princes commencing with Tenungu Bijjana on the one side, and Chôḍa Ballaya Chôḍa on the

other is proved beyond the shadow of a doubt by the discovery of their inscriptions. Therefore, there need be no discussion here about their historicty. We shall now turn our attention to the other section of the genealogy. The contents of two important documents must be closely examined in this connection. One of them[1] is a grant of Mahâmaṇḍalêsvara Nanni Chôḍa, and his brothers, members of the Koṭyadona branch of the Telugu Chôḷa family. It gives us an account of the early Chôḷas commencing with one, Jatâ Chôḍa who, having conquered the Drâviḍa-Panchaka, ruled it from the renowned city of Uraiyûr. His son, Karikâla whose prowess was proclaimed to the world by the pillars of victory which he erected around the earth; who, by building the flood-banks of the Kâvêri, filled the earth and the sky with his glory, and who was the death (kâla) of Sânkyâdharas, ruled all countries from the city of Kânchi. To Mahimâna of this Solar dynasty were born three sons, Karikâla, Dasavarman, and Toṇḍaman. Of the three, Dasavarman conquered Pâkarâshṭra, and ruled the earth with Pottapi as his capital.

This inscription gives us the following list of early Chôḷa kings:

Jatâ Chôḍa
|
Karikâla I.
:
Mahimâna Chôḍa
|
Karikâla II — Dasavarman — Toṇḍaman

[1]S. I. I., vol. VI No. 660.

This list, although complete in a sense, does not at all make it clear how Mahimâna was related to Karikâla I. However, this defect is made good by another Telugu Chôḷa inscription[a] of about the same time. Oppilisiddhi II, the donor of this inscription was a contemporary of the Kâkatiya king Gaṇapati by whose help he supplanted the Koṭyadona Chôḷas, and became the master of their territories. We understand from his grant that the Solar dynasty was known as the dynasty of Karikâla after his birth. To him was born a son called Mahimâna Chôḍa; and three sons, favourites of fortune, Karikâla, Dasavarman, and Toṇḍaman were born to him. We get from this inscription, the followin list of kings.

Karikâla I
|
Mahimâna-Chôḍa
|
Karikâla II | Dasavarman | Toṇḍaman.

The two lists that are given above show no real differences. They are essentially the same. Therefore, by combining the two, we get a comprehensive list of the descendants of Jaṭâ Chôḍa.

Jaṭâ Chôḍa
|
Karikâla I
|
Mahimâna Chôḍa
|
Karikâla II | Dasavarman | Toṇḍaman.

[a]S. I. I. VI 628.

One branch of the Telugu Chôḷas traces its origin from Karikâla II, and another from Dasavarman. They seem to have originally held portions of Cudappah district whence they spread in all directions. The Chôḷas of the Tamil country, from whom the Telugu Choḷas claim to have descended, were a very ancient royal family. The Tamils possess a very ancient literature which may be expected to throw some light upon early Chôḷa history. The so called Sangam literature is said to contain eulogies of Karikâla and his father. The epic, Maṇimêkalai mentions a Chôḷa monarch who is believed to be the son of Karikâla. The followlng genealogy is reconstructed from the references to the Chôḷa soveriegns contained in the early Tamil classics.

Iḷam-Jet-chenni
|
Karikâla
|
Mâvan or
Neḍumuḍi Kiḷḷi
|
Udayakumâra — Toṇḍaman Iḷam-Tiraiyan

The words "Chenni"[1] and "Kiḷḷi" are synonyms for Chôḷa[2]. Iḷam-Jetchenni means young Jaṭâ Chôḷa, which was, according to the Telugu Chôḷa genealogy, the name of the father of Karikâla. The son of Karikâla had several names, Neḍumuḍi Kiḷḷi, Velvel Kiḷḷi etc. One of his names was Mâvan Kiḷḷi[3] which means 'the great

[1] K. V. S. Iyer, Anc. Decc. P. 201.
[2] S. K. Iyengar. Manimekalai, Intro. P. 36.
[3] Ibid P. 36, Text P. 156.

the powerful or the glorious Chôḷa'. That is also the meaning of 'Mahimân' the resemblance of which to Mâvan is very close and striking. It is nowhere explicitly stated in the Tamil classics how Mâvan or Neḍumuḍi Kiḷḷi was related to Karikâla. Tamil scholars are, however, unanimous in accepting the ancient tradition, in accordance with which Mâvan Kiḷḷi was the son of Karikâla. Chenguṭṭuvân Chêra and Iḷango Aḍigal were the sons of a Chôḷa "of high car drawn by seven horses". "It is possible, with good reason, to equate him with Karikâla."[1] Mâvan Kiḷḷi had two sons, Udaiyakumâra, and Toṇḍaman Iḷan-Tiraiyan. The former was the lover of Maṇimêkalai, and he was murdered by the jealous Vidyâdhara, Kânchana. The latter was the son born to king Kiḷḷi (Mâvan) by Pîli Vaḷai, the daughter of the Nâga chief Vaḷai Vâṇaṇ. Mâvan Kiḷḷi is said to have married a Bâṇa princess, and probably she was the mother of Toṇḍaman Iḷam-Tiraiyan. Some doubt may be entertained about this; but there can be no doubt about Pîli Vaḷai, the mother of Toṇḍaman being a Bâṇa princess. Her Bâṇa origin is proved by the name of her father, 'Vaḷai Vâṇan.' The surname 'Vâṇaṇ' is idetical with Bâṇan. In Tamil 'v' and 'b' are interchangeable, and the change does not affect the meaning. The word 'Vâṇarâyar' is made use of frequently for 'Bâṇarâyer' in later Tamil inscriptions. Therefore, there need be no hesitation in accepting that 'Vâṇan' and 'Bâṇan' are identical, and that Vaḷai Vâṇan the father-in-law of king Kiḷḷi of Maṇimekalai was a Bâṇa chief. It may be suggested here that

[1] Ibid.

'Vaḷai' is a corrupt form of Bali, a name which occurs in the Bâṇa genealogy. The Bâṇas ruled in Vaḍugâvaḷi or Andhrapatha, which seems to be identical with Pâkarâshṭra. It may be noted in this connection that Dasavarman one of the sons of Mahimâna Chôḷa (Mâvan Kiḷḷi) is said to have conquered this region. It seems, therefore, that during the time of Mâvan Kiḷḷi, the Chôḷas had intimate family relations with the Bâṇas of Vaḍugâvaḷi or Andhrapatha. The traditions of the Tamil and the Telugu Chôḷas appear to come into close contact here.

We shall now institute a comparison between the two dynastic lists *viz.*, the Telugu and the Tamil.

Telugu.

Jatâ Chôḍa
|
Karikâla I
|
Mahimân
|
Karikâla II — Dasavarman — Toṇḍaman

Tamil.

Iḷam Chet-chenni = Young Jatâ Chôḍa
|
Karikâla
|
Mâvan Kiḷḷi
|
Udayakumâran. — Toṇḍaman (Ilam-Tiraiyan.)

These two tables are almost identical. The Chet or Jet Chenni of the Tamil classics is same as Jatâ Chôḍa of the Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions. Mâvan Kiḷḷi is identical with Mahimâna Chôḍa. Udaiyakumâran of

the Tamil list does not appear in the Telugu list; nor is there any mention of Karikâla II, and Dasavarman in the Tamil list. But Toṇḍaman is common to both of them. The following table of the early Chôḷa kings is in complete agreement with the Tamil classics and the Telugu inscriptions.

Chet-Chenni =
Jatâ Chôḍa
|
Karikâla
|
Mâvan Kiḷḷi =
Mahimâna Chôḍa
|
Toṇḍaman

This genealogical table represents four successive generations of early Chôḷa kings. It has the support of the unbroken tradition of the Tamils and the Telugus. It also establishes that the Telugu Chôḷa genealogy is genuine. The historical accuracy of the information furnished by the Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions need not unnecessarily be doubted.

We have already noted that the historical introduction with which most Andhra Chôḍa inscriptions commence, recognizes that Karikâla and Trilôchana were contemporaries. In the light of what has been said above, there is no room for entertaining any reasonable doubt. The Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions are unanimous in supporting this synchronism. The literature of the Tamils and the Telugus admits it. Ancient Tamil and Telugu writers speak of Karikâla's conquest of India as far as the Himâlayas. All these seem to indicate the expansion of the Chôḷa power northwards; and the first

state that should have been affected by such an expansion was certainly the kingdom of the Pallavas of Kânchî that lay between the the kingdom of the Chôḷas, and those of the Deccan and Northern India.

SECTION 6.

So far, we have explained our reasons for holding that Trilôchana Pallava was an historical character; but there are two possible objections that may be raised against this view. (1) Trilôchana Pallava is said to have possessed three eyes. On this point the evidence of the Local Records, literature, and epigraphy is unanimous. Now the possession of three eyes by a person is contradicted by human experience. How then can it be maintained that a three-eyed person existed? Such an individual could not have been a human being. As supernatural beings such as angels and devils, are beyond the sphere of history, we must leave Trilôchana Pallava to be dealt with by the writers of fairy tales.

Although Trilôchana is unanimously believed to have had three eyes, we hold that his third eye was a myth which had grown out of his name. The name, Trilôchana or Mukkanṭi means "the three-eyed" one. Just as a Mr. Fox or a Mr. Madox does not possess the qualities of foxes or mad oxen, a person possessing the name of Trilôchana need not have three eyes. In fact, there is only one Trilôchana or Mukkanṭi *i.e.*, Śiva who has three eyes; all the other Trilôchanas that are named after him, have only the name but not the 'third eye.'

We believe that the "third eye" of Trilôchana Pallava was bestowed upon him by the engravers whom

the Telugu Chôḷa princes employed in their service. We must pay special attention to the historical introduction of the Andhra Chôḷa inscriptions. It runs thus: *Charana Sarôruha Vihita Vilôchana Trilôchana* &c.,' which means "the eyes of Trilôchana &c., are set on the lotus-feet (of Karikâla)." In many inscriptions, the word '*vihata*' is substituted for '*vihita*'; and this slight modification in the spelling of the word alters the meaning of the sentence. It means, after the change, "the eyes of Trilôchana &c, are put out by the lotus-feet (of Karikâla)"[1]. What must originally have been a simple mistake of the engraver, appears to have been eagerly seized upon by the court pundits to enhance the glory of Karikâla, the forefather of their patrons. He should be represented as a monarch who could inflict severest punishment even upon the proudest of princes. The words 'Trilôchana' and 'vihata,' suggested the form of the punishment. They, however, knew that Trilôchana was not blinded by Karikâla; it would be improper to allow him to be deprived of his eyes. The name 'Trilôchana' came in handily. It was interpreted literally. A story was invented to the effect that Trilôchana had three eyes, and that the third eye was put out by Karikâla who was incensed at his contumacious conduct. Trilôchana appears to have obtained his third eye in this wise.

(2) Again, he is represented as having been born of a virgin. This is a miraculous event which justly claims a place in a book of fairy tales. The statement that Trilôchana was the son of a virgin is supported by the evidence of the Local Records, literature and

[1] Nell. Dist. Inscr.

inscriptions. One inscription[1] tells us that he was the son of a Brahman virgin. According to Nava Chôḷa Charita and the kaifiyat of Talpagiri,[2] she became pregnant by the grace of Siva. This is dimly indicated by the phrase "*Isvara vamsajah*" which occurs with reference to Trilôchana in a number of Nôḷamba inscriptions.[3] The legend thus appears to be fairly ancient. How are we to explain it? It seems to us that it was deliberately invented to cover up certain facts connected with the birth of Trilôchana. He is called in many records a son of Siva. Why? This was done, to hide his illegetimate birth. The famous Andhra poet, Vêmulavâḍa Bhîma who was born of a widow was called a son of the God Bhîmêsvara of Drâkshârâma. The widow is said to have circulated a story that she became pregnant by the grace of Siva, who was, therefore, the father of her son. In fact, this widow like many other widows misbehaved, but she only had the audacity to attribute the fatherhood of her child to the ascetic God, Siva. Similar circumstances may explain the ascription to Siva of the fatherhood of Trilôchana. There appears to be some hint about his illegitimacy in some of the inscriptions.[4] They tell us that he was the son of a Brahman virgin and the God Siva. As far as his birth is concerned, it does not appear to have any connection with the Pallavas. Strangely enough, he is called Trilôchana Pallava. In one kaifiyat,[5] he is called Pallavâdhisvara. Does this not indicate that he was an illegitimate son of some Pallava king? The kaifiyat of Kôṭa[6] which mentions that he was the son of Toṇḍaman Chakravarti does not contradict this view. His illegitimate birth, and the

[1]D1. [2]A19. [3]S.I.I. VI No. 561. [4]D1. [5]A6. [6]A1.

subsequent usurpation of the throne of Kânchi are probably responsible for the omission of his name from the Pallava genealogy. A somewhat similar instance is furnished by the history of the Bâdâmi Châḷukyas. Mangaḷêsa who usurped the throne of his nephew is not at all mentioned in all the Châḷukya genealogies subsequent to the reign of Pulakêsin II. The legend of the virgin-birth does not make Trilôchana a mythical ruler; but, if properly interpreted it seems to throw much valuable light upon the circumstances of his birth and early career.

SECTION 7.

The foregoing discussion has made two points quite clear: (1) that Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi or Trilôchana Pallava was an historical character, and (2) that he was a contemporary of Karikâla Chôḷa. We have yet to determine the time when he lived. Although more information is at present available on the subject than twenty years ago, we are not yet in a position to fix his date with precision. The material at our disposal does not help us in securing satisfactory results. Some of the local histories which pretend to give us his dates accurately are in hopeless disagreement, and they suggest in many cases a date which takes us far into the past. His date, according to the Local Records, ranges from Kali 2000 to Saka 513. The kaifiyats of Sankarâtripâḍu[1], Sara[2] and other villages mention 2000 Kali as his date. The records of Vangipuram[3] and Upputûr[4] assign him to Kali 1986: the kaifiyat of Chauḍêsvari-Nandavaram[5] fixes his date at Kali 1570; Sara[6] would have it at

[1]A20; [2]A5; [3]A47; [4]A18; [5]A16; [6]A5.

Kali 1540. The kaifiyat Maṇḍrêḍu[1] vaguely asserts that he reigned at the commencement of the Kali era. Some kaifiyats bring down his date to a period subsequent to the foundation of the Sâlivâhana era. One[2] (Anantavaram) fixes his date at S 220; and another[3] (Kôṭa) assigns him to the period succeeding S 513. It is impossible to draw any valid inference from such material as this. We must, therefore, abandon all hope of fixing his date with the aid of the evidence supplied by the Local Records.

However, Local Records roughly indicate the period during which he must have lived. He appears to have taken an active part in suppressing the heretical faiths of Buddhism and Jainism. The Vaidica movement seems to have already begun in the 4th century A.D. It did not, however, transform itself into a persecuting religion until the middle of the 6th century A.D. Buddhism was already declining when Hiuen Tsaing visited South India during the middle of the 7th century A.D. The pilgrim remarks that in the country of the Andhras, "there are twenty sanghâramas with 3000 priests. There are thirty Dêva temples with many heretics"[4]. In Dhânyakaṭaka, "The convents (Sanghâramas) are *numerous, but they are mostly deserted and ruined*; Of those preserved, there are about twenty with 1000 priests.......*There are 100 Dêva temples, and the people who frequent them are numerous, and of different beliefs.*"[5] Buddhism was not in a more flourishing condition in Chu-li-ye or Rênâḍu (the modern ceded Districts). The pilgrim obseves, "The disposition of men

---

[1] A21; [2] A38½; [3] A1.

[4] Travels: Waters Popular Edition P. 218; [5] Ibid P. 221.

is naturally fierce; they are attached to heretical teaching. *The sanghâramas are ruined and dirty as well as the priests. There are some tens of Dêva temples, and many Nirgrantha heretics*".[1]

Thus, Buddhism was in a ruinons state in Andhra and Dhamnakaṭaka. The Jainas were conspicuous by their absence. The Sanghâramas were 'numerous' in the latter place but they were 'deserted and ruined'. Dhamnakaṭaka was the most famous centre off Buddhism in South India. The decay of Buddhism in this nerve-centre of the Buddhistic religious activity means that the church was already dead in the Telugu country. It is interesting to note that, according to the Local Records, Dharanikôṭa which is but another name for Dhamnakataka was the capital of Trilôchana Pallava, the arch enemy of Jainism and Buddhism. We understand that he destroyed at Buddham near Yâbuti a Buddhist vihâra.[2] He was also responsible for the destruction of a Jaina basadi at Kandrâjupâḍu.[3] He ruined a settlement of Jaina monks at Nâgarâjupâḍu.[4] The kaifiyats of Anantavaram[5] and Santarâvûr[6] attribute to him the general destruction of the Jainas, the Bauddhas, and the Chârvakas in his kingdom. It is probable that the decay of these two religions was the result of the peresecuting activity of Trilôchana Pallava. Although the Buddhists very nearly disappeared from the Telugu country, the Jainas still lingered on until the 13th century A.D. when they were mercilessly rooted out by the persecuting hands of the Vîrasaivas.

---

[1]Ibid P. 227.

[2]A 24; [3]A 27; [4]A 39; [5]A 33. [6]A 17.

In marked contrast to the ruined condition of Buddhism and Jainism in the Telugu country, they appear to have been prospering in Drâviḍa and Mâlakûṭa. In Kânchîpura, the capital of Drâviḍa, there were 80 Dêva temples, and 100 sanghâramas with 10,000 priests. Besides, there were many Nirgranthas.[1] Although Buddhism was almost non-existent in Mâlakuṭa, Jainism appears to have been highly prosperous. The Buddhist convents were in a ruinous condition, only the walls standing. "There were many hundreds of Dêva temples, and a multitude of heretics mostly belonging to the Nirgranthas."[2]

It appears from this that although there were many Hindus in Kânchipura and Mâlakûṭa the former was a stronghold of the Bauddhas and the latter of the Jainas. If Buddhism and Jainism very nearly disappeared from the coastal districts of the Telugu country in the 7th century A.D., their disappance must be attributed to the persecuting zeal of an orthodox Hindu king like Trilôchana Pallava who must have flourished at an earlier epoch.

The inscriptions, however, yield a more satisfactory result. The Humcha inscription[3] (A.D., 942) of the Nôḷamba chief, Dilîparasa speaks of Trinayana Pallava as the progenitor of the Nôḷamba family. Mangaḷarasa-Nôḷambâdhirâja, the founder of this family, must have lived about the middle of the 8th century A.D. Therefore, Trinayana Pallava must be assigned to an earlier period. The Telugu Chôḷa king, Manuma Siddha II mentions in his Nandalûr inscription,[4] (S 1179), a Trilô-

---

[1] Travels of Hiuen Tsaing : Watters : Popular Edition p. 229.
[2] Ibid p. 231.
[3] S. I. I VI. 561.
[4] Epi. Rep for 1908.

chana Pallava who made a gift of Perungandûra to Brahmans in S 743 (821 A.D.). He is said to be the descendent of another Trilôchana who made a grant of 70 agrahâras to Brahmans in the neighbourhood of the Tripurantaka Hill. It must be this Trilôchana that was the contemporary of Karikâla Chôḷa. He should have lived, therefore, at a time considerably anterior to A.D., 821. The earliest reference to Mukkanṭi or Trilôchana Pallava occurs in a fragmentary inscription[1] (A.D. 660) of the Western Châḷukya king Vikramâditya I. Mukkanṭi should, therefore, have flourshed before the middle of the 7th century. We understand from an inscription of S 1070[2] that he lived long before the 7th century. According to this inscription, Rudrabhaṭṭa an immigrant Brahman from Ahichhatra in Northern India, obtained from Mukkanṭi Pallava the agrahâra of Vangipura. Sûryabhaṭṭa, a descendent of this Rudrabhaṭṭa received the gift of the agrahâra of Mâraṭûr in the land of the Râṭṭas from Satyâsraya-Pulakesin II. Kuppanârya, a brother of Sûryabhaṭṭa obtained the agrahâra of Krânza from Vishṇuvardhana (Kubja). Now, Pulakesin II reigned at Bâdâmi from 610 to 642 A.D., and Kubja Vishṇuvardhana ruled Vengi from 617 to 634 A.D. It is clear that Sûryabhaṭṭa and Kuppanârya should have obtained their respective agrahâras during the interval between A.D., 617 and 634. Their ancestor Rudrabhaṭṭa, the contemporary of Trilôchana Pallava should have lived a few generations earlier. It follows from this that Mukkanṭi or Trilôchana should have lived some generations earlier than Satyâsraya-Pulakesin II, and his

---

[1] Nell. Dist. In. I D 2.

[2] S. I. I VI 620.

brother Kubja Vishṇuvardhana. We arrive at the same conclusion from a study of the Durjaya inscriptions. According to one of them[1] (dated S 1060), Buddha I, the founder of the Durjaya family of Giripaschima, was a subordinate of Trilôchana Pallava, the king of Kânchi. We understand from another[2] that one of his descendents, Buddha II was the promoter of the prosperity of the Châḷukyas. We learn from the other Durjaya inscriptions[3] that Buddha II was a devoted servant of Vishṇuvardhana I, the founder of the Eastern branch of the Châḷukya dynasty.

Although the inscriptions, whose evidence we have cited above, supply us with some interesting information which has a bearing on the subject, they do not at all help us in fixing the date of Trilôchana precisely. Neverthless, they indicate the age during which he appears to have lived. It is not possible for us to ascertain the number of generations that might have passed between Buddha I and Buddha II. We may not be far from the truth, if we suppose that there might have been an interval of a hundred years between the two ; but this is a sheer guess which is not based on facts.

The Eastern Chaḷukya grants of the 10th and the 11th centuries A.D., seem to throw some light on the subject. They tell us that Vijayâditya, the founder of the Châḷukya dynasty was slain in an encounter with Trilôchana Pallava. "A king of this race', so the strory runs 'Vijayâditya by name, having gone to the

[1] S. I. I. VI No. 103,

[2] Mackenze M. S. S. Vol. p. 770,

[3] E. I. Vol. VI.

Deccan with the desire of conquest (and) having challenged Trilôchana Pallava met with his death. During the battle, his chief queen, who had been pregnant for six months, reached an agrahâra called Muḍivêmu, and being protected like a daughter by Vishṇubhaṭṭa Sômayâjin who dwelt there, gave birth to a son Vishṇuvardhana."[1]

This passage asserts that Vijayâditya the founder of the Châḷukya family was a contemporary of Trilôchana Pallava. But Vijayâditya is said to be a mythical, and not a historical person. The most important reason for assuming that Vijayâditya was a mythical person is that his name, and the story of his migration do not find a place in the inscriptions of the Châḷukyas of Bâdâmi. It is also pointed out that the genealogical tables of the Châḷukyas of Bâdâmi and Vengi differ considerably regarding the names of the early kings.

The earliest inscriptions which contain genealogical accounts of the early Châḷukyas belong to the reign of Mangaḷêsa. They give us the following list of kings:

Jayasimha
|
Raṇarâga
|
Satyâsraya = Pulakêsin I
(Raṇavikrama)
|

Kîrtivarman I (Raṇaparâkrama)	Mangaḷêsa (Raṇavikrânta)

Being the earliest records of the family, their evidence is considered more reliable than that of the

[1] E. I. VI p. 239.

later inscriptions. Although the Yêwûr stone tablet[1] alludes to the kings whose fortunes were 'impeded by wicked people', the genealogy which it contains tallies with the one that is given above. But the Eastern Châḷukya grants of the same age ignore Jayasimha and Raṇarâga altogether, and mention in their place, the names of two other kings Vishṇuvardhana and Vijayâditya. We have, therefore, two dynastic lists of the early Châḷukyas.

Badami	*Vengi*
Jayasimha	Vishṇuvardhana
|	|
Raṇarâga	Vijayâditya
|	|
Pulakêsin I	Pulakêsin I

The displacement of Jayasimha and Raṇarâga in the Vengi genealogy by Vishṇuvardhana and Vijayâditya cannot be explained easily. It may be said that the Eastern Châḷukya kings of the 10th century introduced new names to suit the needs of a newly invented legendary genealogy. It is difficult however to understand how the old names are less suitable than the new ones. Therefore, there must be some other reason for the substitution of the new names. Whatever might have been the cause, the change is more apparent than real. There seems to be no irreconcilable difference between the two lists. We are of opinion that Vishṇuvardhana and Vijayâditya should be identified with Jayasimha and Raṇarâga respectively. Vishṇuvardhana and Raṇarâga are not proper

[1] I.A. VIII P. 10.

names but birudas. The name Vishṇuvardhana means "he who is nourished by Vishṇu [bhaṭṭa Sômayajin]". It could not have been the original name of the prince. His real name might have been Jayasimha. We can easily show that Raṇarâga was a mere biruda, and not a proper name. Several early Châḷukya kings bore similar birudas.

Vikramâditya I was known as Raṇarasika			
Mangaḷêsa	„	„	Raṇavikrânta
Kîrtivarman	„	„	Raṇaparâkrama
Pulakêsin I	„	„	Raṇavikrama.

Raṇarâga is a name similar to Raṇarasika, Raṇavikrânta, Raṇaparâkrama, and Raṇavikrama, which are mere birudas. Therefore, the name Raṇarâga must be regarded as a biruda and not as a proper name. The real name of the king who is generally known as Raṇarâga should have been Vijayâditya, a name which occurs frequently in the Châḷukya genealogy.

We have stated our reasons for identifying Vishṇuvardhana and Vijayâditya of the Vengi genealogy with Jayasimha and Raṇarâga of Bâdâmi. If we are right in our surmise, Vijayâditya, the opponent of Trilôchana Pallava must be the father of Jayasimha-Vishṇuvardhana. In that case, it is possible to fix the probable date of Trilôchana Pallava. According to the accepted chronology, Kîrtivarman I ascended the throne of Bâdâmi in 566-7 A.D. Granting 20 years on an average for each reign, the three kings who preceded Kîrtivarman I should have ruled for a period of 60 years. If we deduct 60 from 566-7, we get 506-7 A.D. as the probable date of Jayasimha-Vishṇuvardhana. According to the legend, he was not yet born at the time when his

father was slain by Trilôchana Pallava. Twenty years at least must have elapsed, before Jayasimha could establish himself in a kingdom. The probable date of the battle which ended so fatally to Vijayâditya must have been fought somewhere about A.D. 486. Therefore, Trilôchana Pallava appears to have lived during the closing years of the 5th century A.D. That must have also been the time when his great rival Karikâla flourished.

SECTION 8.

We have fixed the date of Trilôchana or Mukkanṭi Pallava at A.D. 486. Although this date is only tentative, it indicates the probable age during which he must have lived. We shall now proceed to describe the events that are associated with his reign. It appears that soon after he ascended the throne of Kânchi, he started on an expedition of conquest. We are told that he conquered a number of local chieftains who held the country on the northern banks of the Kṛishna. The most important principality which he subdued was Viraja (in the Nizam's Dominions), a stronghold of the of the Durjayas[1]. According to the kaifiyat of Anantavaram[2], his dominions extended as far as Warrangal which served him as his second capital, probably during the closing years of his reign. The newly acquired territory was far away from his capital, Kânchi from which he must have found it extremely difficult to govern it directly. Therefore, he parcelled it out among a numbar of feudatory chiefs, a step which appears to have established his authority permanently in this region. His name is usually associated in the

[1] Mackenzie Mss Vol. II P 770. [2] A 39

inscriptions with two important wars which he is said to have waged with two southern kings.(1) The Eastern Châḷukya inscriptions show that Vijayâditya, the founder of that dynasty, while attempting to carve out a principality for himself in Northern Carnâṭa, was slain by Trilôchana.(2) The Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions inform us that he opposed the advance of the Chôḷas towards the north, and was defeated by Karikâla who not only wrested from him the major part of his kingdom, but made him his vassal. It is presumed by some that these two events are interconnected. One writer[1] asserts that "Trilôchana Pallava had to meet the combined forces of Karikâla and Vijayâditya, and the two last were on some terms of alliance, which are not quite plain·········It looks as if Karikâla was instrumental in permanently settling the Western Châḷukyas in Southern India." It appears from this that the Pallava power was overthrown by a Châḷukya-Chôḷa alliance. This view, however is not tenable as it is opposed to certain facts from which we can infer the probable trend of events.

It is very much to be doubted whether Vijayâditya was a northerner at all. Certain important considerations induce us to believe that he was a southern adventurer[2] who attempted to rise to the position of an independent ruling chief. Even if we presume that he was a prince of Ayôdhya, he was a mere adventurer with whom Karikâla would not have considered it worth his while to enter into an alliance. The Châḷukya inscriptions which describe the battle between Vijayâditya and Trilôchana tell us that after the death of the former, his queen had

---

[1] K V S. Iyer Anc. Decc P.192. [2] See K. V. L. Rao: Memorial Volume.

to seek shelter under the roof of a Brahman in an obscure agrahâra. If Vijayâditya were an ally of Karikâla and if the latter had won a victory over Trilôchana, there would have been no need for her to take refuge with Vishṇubhaṭṭa Sômayâjin who appears to have been a purôhita of Trilôchana Pallava. On accouut of these considerations we are obliged to reject the view that Vijayâditya was an ally of Karikâla, and that the downfall of Trilôchana was brought about by a combined attack of their forces.

Of the two political events which figure prominently in the inscriptions in connection with Trilôchana, his encounter with the Châḷukyas appears to have taken place earlier. Deccan was passing through a period of political confusion owing to the disruption of the Vâkâṭaka kingdom. A host of obscure feudatory princes began to fish in the troubled waters. The Kaṭachuris in Mâlwa, the Nalas in Vidarbha, and the Châḷukyas in Kuntala were busy building independent kingdoms for themselves. The Châḷukyas came into conflict with the Kadambas of Banavâsi who were their immediate neighbours. The aggressive attitude of the Châḷukyas, and their probable encroachments upon the Kadamba territory induced Trilôchana Pallava to declare war upon them.

In order to understand the policy which Trilôchana adopted towards the rising power of the Châḷukyas, it is necessary that we should possess some knowledge of the early history of South India, since the disappearance of the Sâtavâhana power. The whole of South India, probably as far as Cuddalore was included within the empire of the Andhras. During the time of the later

Sâtavâhana princes, a few fendatory families acquired much power and influence in the southern provinces of the empire. Of the feudatory families that became powerful, the Chûṭus, a family of Nâga princes, held sway over Kuntala They entered into marriage alliances with the Mahâraṭhis in the south. After the final dissolution of the Andhra Empire, the whole of South India including Kuntala passed into the hands of the Mahâraṭhi prince Skanda Nâga or Sivaskanda Nâga. He had no sons, but a daughter to succeed him. She was given in marriage to a Pallava chief called Vîrakûrcha. After the death of Sivaskanda Nâga, Vîrakûrcha succeeded him in all his dominions becoming thereby the founder of the Pallava royal family. The Pallavas thus acquired control over the Southern Andhra Empire including Kuntala in the West.*

Some writers[1] believe that Kuntala passed from the Andhrabhṛityas, as the Nâga chiefs were called, directly into the hands of the Kadambas. They hold that Kadambas were independent from the beginning[2] and that Kuntala was never included in the Pallava dominions. This view is not based on facts. The early history of the Kadambas is narrated by Kakusthavarman, the great-grandson of Mayûravarman, the founder of the family, in his inscription at Tâḷaguṇḍa in Mysore[3]. The account contained in this inscription contradicts the view mentioned above. The Kadambas were a family of vaidica Brahmans that resided in the Kanarese country. Mayûrasarman a member of this family went

*See Dubreuil, Anc. Hist of Deccan. pp. 46—52.

[1]Rapson. Catalogue of the Andhra Coins. Intr.

[2]Dubreuil. Anc. Decc.

[3]E. I. VIII P. 24.

to the city of Kânchi with his preceptor, Virasarman to complete his Vêdic studies at the famous University. He quarrelled with a 'Pallava horseman', and desirous of avenging the insult he sought refuge in the impenetrable forests at the foot of the Srîparvata where he set up the standard of rebellion against the Pallava lords of Kânchi. "He levied many taxes from the circle of kings headed by the Great-Bâṇa." "When the enemies, the kings of Kânchi, came in strength to fight him, he··· lighted upon the ocean of their army, and struck it like a hawk full of strength." "The Pallava lords having found out this strength of his, as well as his valour and lineage, said that to ruin him would be no advantage, and so they quickly chose him even for a friend. Then entering the kings' service, he pleased them by his acts of bravery in battles, and obtained the honour of being crowned with a fillet, offered by the Pallavas with the sprouts (pallava) of their hands. And (he) also (received) a territory bordered by the water of the western sea...and bounded by the Prêhara secured to him under the compact that others should not enter it."[1]

This passage gives us in the language of the inscription an account of the circumstances under which Mayûrasarman obtained the lordship of Kuntala. The struggle between him and the Pallavas was a protracted one. Though Mayûra was able to maintain his own against the Pallavas, it cannot be said that he had always been successful. If success favoured every one of his attempts, he would not have been party to a

[1] E. I. VIII. 35.

treaty in accordance with the terms of which he had to enter the service of the Pallavas, his erstwhile enemies, as a 'daṇḍanâyaka or a general.'[1] He pleased his masters 'by his acts of bravery in many battles.' And it was as a reward for his valuable services that he obtained the territory between the Western sea and the Prêhâra, on the condition that none should enter it. The view that Mayûra asserted his independence goes against all evidence. His rebellion ended in a compromise, and to that extent, it was a failure; but it enabled him to become a force to be reckoned with in the politics of the day. It must also be recognised that the foundation of the Kadamba kingdom had no direct connection with Mayûra's rebellion. The Tâḷaguṇḍa inscription, therefore, contradicts the view that Kuntala passed directly into the hands of the Kadambas from the Andhrabhṛityas or that the Kadambas were independent from the beginning. Mayûra appears to have received Kuntala as a military fief from the Pallava lords of Kânchî who were "pleased with his acts of bravery in battles."[2]

It appears that Mayûra and his immediate successors were mere sâmantas dependent upon the Pallavas. Kakustha describes his family as 'the family of Kaḍamba sênânis'. In addition to this, the rulers mentioned in the Tâḷaguṇḍa inscription had no titles indicative of royal power. They are introduced merely as Mayûravarman, Kangavarman, Bhagîratha, Raghu, and Kakustha. The title 'Mahârâja' connoting royal power is conspicuous by its absence. The successors of

---

[1] E. I. VI.
[2] *Ibid.*

Kakustha, however, assume this title. Krishṇavarman I, the son and successor of Kakustha, bore the titles Dharmarâja and Dharmamahârâja[1], and all his discendants called themselves Dharmamahârajas[2]. The same biruda was borne by Mṛigêsa, Mândhâtṛi and Raghu. It appears from this that there was some difference in status between the first four Kadamba kings and their successors. The first four were mere sâmantas of the Pallavas of Kânchî, and their successors assumed royal titles, and laid claims to royal dignity.

The foregoing discussion has made it clear that Mayûra and his succcessors were mere feudatory chiefs, and not independent monarchs. Krishṇavarman I was the first ruler of the principality to lay claims to an independent status. This is indicated by his assumption of titles, Dharmarâja, and Dharmamahârâja. The fact that the Pallavas still regarded themselves as the overlords of the Kadambas is proved by their prompt invasion of Kuntala. The Pallava army was commanded by Nâṇakkasa. The army of Krishṇavarman, led by the Kêkaya prince Śivanandavarman, opposed him. And there ensued a fierce battle in which 'Krishṇavarmarâja's army' was overcome. The country was ruined, and the commander of the army overcome by the disgrace of defeat, ascended the bed of Kusa grass, and committed suicide on the field of battle.[3] The first attempt of the Kadambas to assert their independence failed miserably, and the Pallavas made good their claim.

[1]E. C. IX. Dg. 161.
[2]E. C. V p. 1 p. 184.
[3]E. C. I X Dg. 161.

The next stage in the struggle began with the death of Krishṇavarman I. There was a dispute between his son Vishṇuvarman and his nephews Mṛigêsa and Mândhâtṛi as to who should ascend the throne. The position of Mṛigêsa and Mândhâtṛi seems to have been stronger than that of Vishṇu; for the latter had to make an appeal for support to his overlords at Kânchi. The Pallavas, no doubt, were ready to avail themselves of any opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of Kuntala. Therefore, they readily despatched an army under Śântivarman, probably a prince of the blood, who overawed all opposition, and set up Vishṇuvarman on the throne of Banavâsi. Neverthless, the war between Vishṇuvarman and his cousins did not come to an end.

It must have been during this period that the Ganga kingdom was founded in Southern Karnâṭa. The early Ganga kings were subordinates of the Pallavas. The Pallava kings Simhavarman and his son Skandavarman installed Aryavarman and his son Mâdhava upon their respective thrones. It seems as if the Pallavas had some motive in taking so much interest in the affairs of Southern Karnâṭa. It was in order to check the growing power of the Kadambas that the Pallavas strengthened the hands of the Gangas. A Ganga-Pallava alliance was formed against the Kadambas. The struggle between Vishṇuvarman and his cousin Mṛigêsa, if it ever stopped, broke out a fresh. He was obliged to make a second appeal to his Pallava overlord, to get rid of his troubles. In response to this request, the combined armies of the Pallavas and the Gangas invaded Kuntala. The allies, however, were not successful. Mṛigêsa claims to have 'rooted out'

the high (tunga) Gangas, and destroyed the Pallavas[1]. However, he seems to have died while the struggle was still going on. But his brother Mândhâtri and his son Ravi carried on the struggle to a successful conclusion. The latter appears to have triumphed over his enemies; for he claims to have slain his cousin Vishṇuvarman and 'rooted out' Chaṇḍadaṇḍa, king of Kânchi.[2] Inspite of this success, he was not able to make himself the king of the whole of Kuntala. He was ruling in the neighbourhood of Hâlsi, whereas Southern Kuntala remained under the sway of the descendants of Vishṇuvarman. The history of the relations between the Kadambas and the Pallavas during this period is so very obscure that it is rather hazardous to assert anything about it definitely. Neverthless, the existence of a few dim indications of the Pallava influence must be recognized.[3] It is not unlikely that the Pallava influence in Southern Kuntala was as complete as before.

The Kadamba grants refer to several Pallava kings; but nowhere have we a clue which may lead to their identification. We are not in a position even to guess the names of the Pallava kings against whom Mayûra rebelled, and under whom he served. Besides them, three other Pallava princes are named in the Kadamba inscriptions. None of them, however, is mentioned in any Pallava grant There is nothing to show that Nâṇakkasa and Śântivarman were kings. The former is spoken of as 'Pallava-raja', and the latter is

---

[1] I. A. VI p. 24.
[2] I. A. VI p. 29.
[3] E. I. VI p.p. 16-17.

called 'mahâraja' and 'Pallavêndra'. Nâṇakkasa was probably a member of some subordinate branch of the Pallava family; but Śântivarman appears to have been connected with the royal family of Kânchi. Neither of them could have ruled at Kânchi, for the distinctive appellation "Kânchisvara" does not occur in connection with their names as with that of Chaṇḍadaṇḍa. It is probable that both of them were mere commanders who were appointed to lead the expeditionary forces against the enemy. The name Chaṇḍadaṇḍa is a mere biruda which was borne by some king of Kânchi; and unless we know his name, it cannot be of much help to us. However, there appears to be a single clue, which if properly followed, may help us to secure more fruitful results.

We understand from an inscription[1] of Mṛigêsavarman that he had to fight a coalition of the Gangas and the Pallavas. We also learn from the Penugoṇḍa plates[2] of Mâdhava II that the Gangas were the feudatories of the Pallavas, and that the Pallava kings Simhavarman and his son Skandavarman were specially responsible for installing Aryavarman and his son Mâdhava upon their respective thrones. The same inscription informs us that Mâdhava had an alias Simhavarman, a name which he assumed in honour of his overlord, the Pallava king Simhavarman. The Gangas were divided into three branches[3] of which the Penugoṇḍa branch was the seniormost. Although the occurrence of names Simhavarmam and Vishṇugôpa betrays the dependence of the

[1] I. A. VI p. 24.
[2] E. I. XIV p. 334.
[3] Re. Mys. Arch 1924 p. 17.

other two branches also upon the Pallavas, the Penugoṇḍa branch appears to have been more intimately allied to them than the others. Mṛigêsa, in the inscription mentioned above, refers to the "tunga-gangas." The term 'tunga' appears to have a special significance. He seems to point out that the Gangas whom he vanquished belonged to the eldest branch of the Ganga family. Moreover, the Kadamba king Vishṇuvarman, the contemporary and rival of Mṛigêsa, had a son called Simhavarman. The name of this king has a strong Pallava odour about it. The three branches of the Ganga family had two Simhavarmans and one Vishṇugopa. These three princes must have been contemporaries, as they belonged to the fourth generation from the founder. The Penugoṇḍa plates give us the reason for the occurrence of these characteristic Pallava names in the Ganga genealogy. They were borne by their respective bearers to please the Pallava overlord or his powerful brother. On this analogy, it is reasonable to suppose that Kadamba Vishṇuvarman gave his son the name, Simhavarman in honour of the Pallava king Simhavarman. The Hebbata grant[1] informs us that his overlord was a Pallava king who could be no other than Simhavarman. Vishṇuvarman was the contemporary of his three cousins Mṛigêsa, Mândhâtṛi, and Ravi, the last of whom put him to death. There is nothing unnatural in the Pallava king Simhavarman being a contemporary of the Kadamba chiefs Vishṇu, Mṛigêsa, Mândhâtṛi and Ravi. We propose to identify Chaṇḍadaṇḍa, the king of Kânchî whom Ravi 'rooted out' with Simhavarman, who is said to have reigned from A.D. 430 to 460 A.D.

[1] Mys. Arch. Re 1925 p. 16.

The Kadamba princes mentioned above must also be assigned to the same period.

We have so far explained the policy which the Pallavas of Kânchî had followed towards the Kadamba kingdom from the time of its foundation to the middle of the 5th century A.D. It was designed to perpetuate the Pallava authority in Kuntala, and keep the Kadambas strictly in a position of political subordination. It was a policy that found favour with several generations of Pallava kings. It was this policy that devolved on Mukkanṭi or Trilôchana Pallava, who, as the inheritor of the traditions of the Pallava statesmanship, felt it his duty to uphold it. In pursuance of this policy, he seems to have led his armies to Kuntala to check the ambitious designs of the Châḷukya adventurer, Vijayâditya. Both the armies appear to have met in Southern Kuntala; and in the battle that ensued, Trilôchana slew Vijayâditya, and vindicated the right of the Pallavas to be regarded as the overlords of Kuntala. Trilôchana thus succeeded in overthrowing his enemies on his northern frontiers, and his relations with those of the south are dealt with in the next section.

SECTION 9.

The rivalry between Trilôchana and Karikâla is alluded to in the Local Records, literature, and the inscriptions. According to them, Karikâla conquered all the countries of the Indian continent as far as the Himâlayas on the slopes of which he had the Chôḷa royal insignia engraved. If his campaigns against the kingdoms of Northern India were true, it would appear that the over-

throw of the power of the Pallavas who hindered the progress of his arms northwards, formed part of a very wide scheme of conquest. Moreover, in attacking the Pallavas, Karikâla followed a policy which was chalked out for him by his predecessors.

The Chôḷas seem to have regarded the Pallavas as intruders in the land of the Tamils; and as patriotic sons of the soil, they appear to have entertained the idea that it was their primary duty to expel them from their country. The early history of the relations between the Chôḷas and the Pallavas is lost in obscurity. Neverthless we get a few glimpses here and there which reveal to us their nature. The Velûrpaḷaiyam plates[1] of Nandivarman III contain a reference to the recapture of Kânchi by a Pallava king called, Kumâravishṇu, who is taken to be the first king of that name. The enemies from whom Kumâravishṇu wrested Kânchi were Chôḷas. We do not however know the circumstances under which the Pallavas lost their hold on Kânchi. Their early history is so very obscure that it is hazardous to make any definite statement about it. We can only conjecture the probable trend of events.

It is more or less definitely settled that the Pallava king Simhavarman of the Penugoṇḍa plates[2] reigned from A. D. 436 to 460.[3] Between him and Kumâravishṇu I, there ruled at Kânchi two kings *viz.*, Buddhavarman and Kumâravishṇu II. Allowing twenty years for each reign on an average, they may be taken as having reigned for a period of forty years. On this

[1]S. I. I. Vol. II.
[2]E. I. XIV.
[3]J. R. A. S. 1915 p. 482.

hypothesis, the reign of Kumâravishṇu I must have commenced in A. D. 376. He should have reigned from A. D. 376 to 396. If Kumâravishṇu I had recaptured Kânchi, the capital of his ancestors, it must have been lost by the Pallavas sometime earlier. Skandavarman the father of Kumâravishṇu I is said to have reigned at Kânchi. Therefore, Kânchi must have been lost and won by the Pallavas between the commencement of the reign of Skandavarman and the close of that of Kumâravishṇu I. What were the circumstances under which the Pallavas lost their hold on their capital during this period?

It is interesting to note that the famous Gupta emperor, Samudragupta led his campaign against South India between A.D. 347 and 350. According to the Allahâbâd Pillar inscription[1] Samudragupta is said to have encountered a king of Kânchi called Vishṇugôpa who is justly taken to be a Pallava. Vishṇugôpa like many other South Indian kings was taken a prisoner by the Gupta king, although he was subsequently released. These events would certainly have caused a commotion in the Pallava kingdom. It is also said that Mayûrasarman rose in rebellion against the Pallavas, taking advantage of the confusion caused by Samudragupta's southern expedition to set himself up as an independent ruler."[2] This was an excellent opportunity for the Chôḷas to drive the Pallavas out of the Tamil country. The Pallava army was vanquished, and probably destroyed; their king was a captive in the camp of the enemy; and several chieftains were setting up the

---

[1]Fleet: Gupta. Inscr p. 7.

[2]Jr. of Myth Soc. VIII July 1918: also Dubreuil Anc. Decc p. 99.

standard of rebellion in different parts of the kingdom. The Chôḷas taking advantage of the troubles of the Pallavas, entered Toṇḍamaṇḍalam, the heart of the Pallava kingdom, and captured Kânchi, the stronghold of the enemy.

It is not known how this Vishṇugôpa was related to Kumâravishṇu I and his father Skandavarman. Who was he? The early Pallava inscriptions do not mention any king of that name. The Sânskṛit inscriptions of the 5th century A.D., mention one, Yuvamahâraja Vishṇugôpavarman; but he was not a king of Kânchi; in fact, he never ascended the throne at all. He was the younger brother of that Simhavarman who figures prominently in the Penugoṇḍa plates; and he was holding sway over the northern districts of the Pallava kingdom about A.D. 446. Yuvamahârâja Vishṇugôpa thus appears to have lived nearly a century later than Samudragupta. Therefore, he could not have been the same person as the Pallava king of that name mentioned in the Allahabad inscription.

The Vâyalûr inscription[1] of Râjasimha furnishes us with a long list of Pallava kings. If it were a reliable document, it would have solved many difficult problems connected with the early history of the Pallavas. The authors of this inscription had no more accurate knowledge of the Pallava genealogy than we have at the present day. The inscription contains several fictitious names and it repeats the names or groups of names of kings. For instance the name of Vîrakûrcha occurs twice; and Nos. 12 to 14 come again as Nos. 15 to 17;

[1]Dubreuil: The Pallavas p. 20.

three kings have been multiplied into six. But the gratest defect of the list is that it contains a jumble of names,—mythical, semi-mythical and historical—which had been brought together without any regard for chronological considerations. Moreover, it is a great mistake to suppose that it represents a list of the kings of Kânchi; e.g., nos. 23, 24, 28, 29, 30 and 31 never ruled at Kânchi. These considerations prevent us from attaching any value to this document. The name of Vishṇugôpa occurs thrice in it. No. 30 is too late to be considered a contemporary of Samudragupta. The relations of Nos. 8 and 19 with their predecessors or successors cannot be determined, as the order of the kings of this list is directly contradicted by the evidence of the early inscriptions.

The Velûrpâḷaiyam plates[1] give us another list of the Pallava kings, in which occurs the name of a king called Vishṇugôpa. His name comes after Kumâravishṇu and Buddhavarman; but the nature of his relationship with these kings is not stated. He could not have been the son and successor of Buddhavarman, for according to the Chendalûr Plates[2], Kumâravishṇu II was the son and the successor of Buddhavarman. The language of the Velûrpâḷaiyam plates indicates the existence of a gap between Buddhavarman and Vishṇugôpa. It is probable that the latter was the same as Yuvamahârâja Vishṇugôpa.

The Pallava inscriptions, therefore, do not give us much help in testing the statement of the Allahâbâd inscription. We may perhaps infer from the Vâyalûr

[1] S. I. I. Ibl. II.
[2] E. I. VIII p. 233.

inscription that there was an ancient Pallava king called Vishṇugopa, although it is impossible to fix his chronological position. But we feel certain that, in view of the statement contained in the Allahâbâd inscription, Vishṇugôpa should have been the reigning king of Kânchi about 350 A. D. He was presumably the predecessor of Kumâravishṇu I. How was he related to that king?

An examination of the genealogy of the early Pallavas may throw some light on this problem. The Hirahadgalli plates[1] give us the names of two kings:

Bappa-Mahârâja
|
Sivaskandavarman.

The British Museum plates[2] of Chârudêvi contain a list of three princes.

Vijaya-Skandavarman
|
Vijaya-Buddhavarman
|
[Buddhyân]kura

Now, Siva-Skandavarman of the Hirahaḍagalli plates has been identified with Vijaya Skandavarman of the British Museum plates. If this identification is accepted, then we have the following list of early Pallava kings.

Bappa-Mahârâja
|
Siva Skandavarman
|
Buddhavarman
|
[Buddhyân]kura

[1] E. I. I pp. 2—10.
[2] E. I. VIII p. 143.

The Chendalûr plates[1] bring to light a line of four kings.

Skandavarman
|
Kumâravishṇu I
|
Buddhavarman
|
Kumâravishṇu II.

We propose to identify Skandavarman of this inscription with Śiva-Skandavarman of the Hirahaḍagalli plates. In that case, we have the following genealogy.

Bappa-Mahâràja
|
Sivaskandavarman
|
Buddhavarman — Buddhyânkura

Kumâravishṇu I
|
Buddhavarman
|
Kumâravishṇu II

Our identification is also supported by the evidence of the Velûrpaḷaiyam plates, according to which Vîra-kûrcha, Skandasishya, Kumâravishṇu, and Buddha-varman ruled at Kânchi in regular succession. Skanda-sishya has been identified with Sivaskandavarman of the Hirahaḍagalli plates, and this identification has been generally accepted. If Skandasishya is the same person as Sivaskandavarman, then Vîrakûrcha must be identi-fied with Bappa-Mahâràja. Therefore, the genealogical table of the Velûrpaḷaiyam plates seems to be identical with the one which we have reconstructed above.

[1]E. I, VIII p. 288,

Sivaskandavarman of the Hirahaḍagalli plates was presumably succeeded by his eldest son Buddhavarman. The latter had a son called Buddhyânkura, a name which is said to be similar to surnames such as Nayânkura, Lalitânkura &c. borne by the later Pallava monarchs.[1] Buddhyânkura thus appears to be a biruda, and the real name of the prince might have been Vishṇugôpa. According to this hypothises, Kumâravishṇu I becomes a brother of Yuvamahârâja Buddhavarman of the British Museum plates, and an uncle of Buddhyânkura whom we have identified with Vishṇugôpa.

We believe that the invasion of Samudragupta took place during the reign of Buddhyânkura-Vishṇugôpa. And, as we have noted already, Mayûrasarman setup the standard of rebellion along the northern frontiers of the Pallava kingdom, and the Chôḷas invaded Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and captured Kânchi. Vishṇugôpa had to contend against several enemies at the same time. Mayûra was not alone. The Bṛihad Bâṇa and other Pallava sâmantas joined him. The Pallavas had to contend against them for a long time. Before they could quell this rebellion, Vishṇugôpa must have died; and Kumâravishṇu succeeded him. It was probably with the help of Mayûra, with whom he entered into an alliance, that Kumâravishṇu drove away the Chôḷas from Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and recaptured Kânchi. However, the Chôḷas were not completely subdued; for according to the Velurpâḷaiyam plates[2], his son, Buddhavarman destroyed their armies and thrust them behind their

[1] E. I. VIII. p, 143.

[2] S. I. I. II.

frontiers. It must be noted in this connection, that during this period, the Chôḷas were an independent people. They did not lose their freedom, until Simhavishṇu, probably to get rid of troublesome neighbours, annexed their territory, and extinguished their monarchy. But that was later. Before Simhavishṇu appeared on the scene, the Pallavas had to suffer much from the Chôḷa attacks, the earliest of which seems to have taken place during the days of Buddhyânkura and his successors. Here we catch the earliest glimpse of that Chôḷa military activity which was destined under the famous king Karikâla, to subvert several thrones not only in the Deccan but also in Northern India.

SECTION 10.

Karikâla is said to be the son of 'Iḷam jet chenni' who was also called 'Iḷamjenni or Iḷaiyôn.' "He was perhaps the heir-apparent to the Chôḷa throne." He seems to have distinguished himself in the wars undertaken by the reigning king who, we might suppose, was his brother."[1] We have identified Iḷam jet chenni with Jata Chôḍa of the Andhra Chôḷa inscriptions. According to one[2] of them, he immigrated to South India from Ayôdhya. The Chôḷa migration to South India is affirmed by several inscriptions. It appears that the earliest Tamil literature speaks of them as the kings of the Solar dynasty. As Ayôdhya was the cradle of the Solar line of kings, the evidence of the Tamil classics may be taken as supporting the Andhra Chôḷa tradition.

[1]Anc. Decc. by K. V. S. Iyer.
[2]S. I. I. VI. No. 651.

It may be noted in this connection, that according to the Purânâs, the Chôḷas and the Pâṇḍyas were originally Kshatriyâs who migrated from Northern India. There appears to be an element of truth in this tradition; but the immigration of the Chôḷas, if at all there was an immigration, should have taken place much earlier than the time of Jaṭâ Chôḍa, the father of Karikâla; for there is ample evidence to prove their existence in South India as early as the 4th century B. C.[1]

Jaṭâ Chôḍa was a great hero who made a conquest of all quarters (digvijaya). He is said to have subdued the kingdoms comprising the Drâviḍa Panchaka[2], and ruled them from his capital Uraiyûr. What were the countries that were included in the Drâviḍa Panchaka? The Brahmans of the Tamil, Telugu, Kanarese, Mahratta, and Gujerat countries are classed as Pancha Drâviḍas, probably because they are found residing in countries which are piedominently Draviḍian in population. The five countries mentioned above are sometimes referred to as Drâviḍa Panchaka. If this interpretation of the term Drâviḍa Panchaka is accepted, it must be admitted that Jatâ Chôḍa conquered the whole of the Deccan and South India. But, it is difficult to maintain, on the slender evidence of a single inscription, that he was such a mighty conqueror. It seems to us that the Draviḍa Panchaka conquered by him was confined to the Tamil country for which the central position Uraiyûr would have eminently fitted her to serve as a capital.

[1] Corpus. Inscr. Ind. I.
[2] S. I. I. VI 651.

It is said that "the accession of Karikâla to the Chôḷa throne is not regular, as he had no claims to it, if the reigning king had any issue. There are also grounds for inferring that on the death of Karikâla's predecessor, there were several claimants to the Chôḷa throne, and Karikâla succeeded in getting it through the aid of his uncle Irumbiḍar-Taliyar."[1] The Telugu Chôḷa inscriptions, however, are silent on the matter. They take it for granted that Jatâ Chôḍa was succeeded by his son in the natural course of events. They are also silent about his early conquests and struggles. This may be due to their ignorance of the events connected with the early history of Karikâla. The inscriptions assert rather vaguely that he was the master of the land bounded by the four seas, an expression which may be applicable to the whole of South India.

Although the Andhra Chôḷa records are very sparing in their references to the early history of Karikâla, they give us a good deal of information regarding his later conquests. Having consolidated his kingdom after subduing the Pâṇḍyas, the Chêras, and the Singalese, he was free to undertake fresh expeditions of conquest. The powerful kingdom of the Pallavas in his neighbourhood stood as a strong barrier preventing the expansion of his power northwards. The destruction of the Pallava state was a necessary step which he had to take in realising his ambition. Besides, the traditional policy which his predecessors had chalked out for him pointed in the same direction. His personal ambition, coupled with the traditional policy of his family induced him to

[1] K. V. S. Iyer Anc. Decc. p. 194.

seek an early opportunity for declaring war upon the Pallavas.

The history of the struggle between Karikâla and Trilôchana is lost in obscurity. Only one incident in this struggle has come down to us with a thick coating of legendary matter. The episode of the construction of the flood-banks of the Kâvêri marks the end and not the beginning of the struggle. By the time that Karikâla commenced to build the embankments, he apppears to have acquired over Trilôchana certain claims to be regarded as his overlord. Karikâla would not have demanded of an independent king to contribute labour for executing a public work in his own kingdom. Such a demand would have been perfectly unnatural. It is reasonable to suppose that Trilôchana was reduced to some sort of vassalage even before Karikâla contemplated the construction of the flood-banks. During the first phase, the struggle appears to have been confined to Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. Trilôchana was defeated, and his capital fell into the hands of his enemy. The Durjaya inscriptions[1] refer to him as the king of Kânchî. One of them[2] informs us that "he ruled the sea-girt earth from Kânchî." But in an Andhra Chôḷa inscription,[3] Karikâla is said to have "governed the whole earth from Kânchî." These inscriptions make it sufficiently clear that Kânchî which was the capital of Trilôchana Pallava was wrested from him by Karikâla.

[1] B 1, B 2.

[2] B 2.

[3] S. I. I. VI. 651.

The construction of the flood-banks of the Kâvêri offered a good opportunity for Karikâla to test the good faith of Trilôchana. He was obliged to find a large number of labourers to work on the embankments. He fell back upon the ancient practice of exacting forced labour. He issued his royal orders to all his subjects so that each family in the kingdom should contribute its quota of labourers. No exemptions were made ; and no excuses were accepted. Even an old forlorn lady had, unconsciously to draw upon the services of the God Siva ! In fact, the work of recruiting labourers was so taxing that it demanded the constant attention of the king. He had to supervise the work personally, and was obliged to visit the houses of his subjects in order to see, if there were any delinquents. Such people were dealt with severely. His need for obtaining labour was so great that he found it necessary to force the Singalese prisoners of war to work like common labourers. Under these circumstances, it was only natural that he should call upon the feudatory chiefs to help him. Many feudatory princes toiled incessantly in pushing the work forward to a successful conclusion. Of the princes that were ordered to proceed to Kâvêri, Trilôchana was probably the only one who declined to obey.

The Nava Chôḷa Charitra[1] gives an elaborate account of the visit of the ambassadors to, and their reception at the Pallava court at Kâḷahasti which was on the northern frontier of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam.

" Then came the envoys from the court of Karikâla, the famous king of the Chôḷas, and said, " King Kari-

[1]P. A. Sastri's Edition : Published by the Andhra Patrika office.

kâla who is building the embankments of the holy Kâvêri requires you to proceed to the river, and assist him in the raising of the banks." Mukkanṭi became indignant at what he considered an unnatural demand. He replied, "I am a king; I have three eyes which indicate my great power. Has that Chôḷa king so far forgotten himself as to ask me to attend to his domestic work? does he not know the prowess and ability of king Mukkanṭi? It is not meet that I should grow angry with you who are his envoys. Go away from this place at once."

The enoys who were thus expelled from the Pallava court reached Karikâla while he was making arrangements for the rapid construction of the banks and reported to him what had taken place. Karikâla's wrath was throughly roused; and he is said to have punished Trilôchana by depriving him of his third eye. Magic apart, Karikâla appears to have resorted to more concrete methods of achieving his purpose. He seems to have invaded the Telugu country to which the territory of Trilôchana was now confined. The memory of this invasion appears to be still green in the minds of the people of the Ceded Districts. It is said in the kaifiyat of Chiṭṭivale[1] that 'Karikâla Mahârâja of Sûryavamsa, soon after he ascended the throne, came conquering from the west, and annexed this country. Then, he destroyed the forests, and in the neighbourhood of the Karigiri to the south of the hill, he planted a village called Pottapi and many others besides. As Pottapi was the most important village, the whole

[1]A12.

locality acquired in course of time the name of Pottapinâḍu. Several kaifiyats refer to certain events which are said to have taken place during the reign of Karikâla. We also understand from a fragment of an inscription[1], probably of the 11th century A.D., that Karikâla allotted lands to the immigrants from Northern India in the country lying at the foot of the Śrîparvata which belonged to the Pallava king. The country in the neighbourhood of the Śrîparvata is specially associated with the name of Trilôchana Pallava. Therefore, this may be taken as a sure indication of the conquest of the Pallava territory in the Telugu country by Karikâla. Moreover, a large number of ancient Chôḷa inscriptions discovered in Rênâḍu (the territory comprising the modern Cudappah and Karnul districts) testify to the existence in that region, of a dynasty of Chôḷa kings claiming to be the descendants of Karikâla, from the middle of the 7th century onwards. These considerations leave no room in our mind to entertain any doubt regarding Karikâla's invasion and the conquest of the Pallava kingdom.

What has been said above makes it clear that Karikâla vanquished Trilôchana in several battles. First, he wrested from him Toṇḍamaṇḍalam with its capital Kânchi; then, he conquered and annexed a large portion of the Pallava dominions in the Telugu country, thereby reducing Trilôchana to a position of insignificance. The latter appears to have made Dharaṇikôṭa on the Krishna his capital, where he seems to have devoted most of his time in suppressing the heretical faiths of Jainism and Buddhism.

---

[1] Bharati VI p. 85.

SECTION 11.

We have traced so far the history of Trilôchana Pallava with the help of the material contained in the Local Records, literature and the inscriptions. Incidentally we have also discussed certain problems connected with the early history of the Kadambas and the Chôḷas so far as they have a bearing upon our subject. We have yet to describe the service which Trilôchana and his great rival Karikâla rendered to their respective subjects and to South Indian civilization.

During the 5th and the 6th centuries of the Christian era, a large part of the Southern Telugu country, corresponding to portions of Chittore, Nellore, and Cudappah districts, was covered by an impenetrable forest. We understand from the kaifiyat of Kôṭa[1] that about Ś 513 there was a big forest extending eastwards from Kâḷahasti (in the Chithore ditrict) to the Bay of Bengal. According to the kaifiyat of Chiṭṭivale,[2] the whole area from the Pennar in the north to the Tirumalai in the south was covered by a forest during the early years of the reign of Karikâla. The kaifiyat of Chaudêsvari-Nandavaram,[3] informs us that, during the reign of Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi, in the country extending from the Pennar in the south to the Nallamalai's in the north the forest was destroyed for purposes of cultivation. The kaifiyat of Talpagiri[4] (Nellore) tells us that

[1] A. 1.
[2] A 12.
[3] A 16.
[4] A 19.

the region surrounding modern Nellore was a forest at the time of Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi.

It appears from this that a huge forest extended from the Bay of Bengal to the Tirumalai Hill on the one hand, and from the latter to the Nallamalais on the other. The site on which the modern town of Nellore stands was included in this forest. Simhapura the ancient name of the city seems to indicate that it was founded by some Pallava monarch probably a Simhavarman or a Simhavishṇu. This forest which was included in the Pallava kingdom made a good part of the country unfit for cultivation. The Pallava monarchs, therefore, felt it their primary duty to make it suitable for carrying on agricultural operations. They caused the destruction of the forests to such an extent that they acquired the surname of Kâḍuveṭṭi or the forest destroyer. Although this work was commenced as early as the reign of Bappa Mahârâja, it appears to have been pushed on vigorously only from the time of Trilôchana Pallava. At any rate, he seems to be the earliest king who bore the surname of Kâḍuveṭṭi. His name, as we have already noted, is specially associated with the country in the neighbourhood of the Srîparvata. It is in this region that after cutting down the forests he planted new villages and towns and settled in them the North Indian immigrants. He is said to have granted to the Brahmans no less than 700 agrahâras[1] in this area. Seven villages, Uppuṭûr, Vangîpura, Kârambêḍu, Solasa, Gunṭûr, Inagallu, and Kârasâla[2] are specially mentioned as the agrahâras which he granted to the Brahmans in

[1] A 23.

[2] A 23.

honour of the Sapta Rishis. Trilôchana did not limit his patronage to the Brahmans only. People of the other communities were also invited from Aryavarta, and lands were given to them in the same locality.[1] Besides he built a large number of temples dedicated to Siva whom he held in high esteem. During his time the heretical faiths such as Jainism and Buddhism, had a greater appeal to popular imagination than Hinduism (which seems to have been crude and unattractive). He reformed Saivism which he brought under the influence of the Northern Brahmans by dismissing the non-aryan priests from the service of the temples. The worship of Siva was purged of all its unaryan impurities, and it was made conformable to the iujunctions of the Veda. Trilôchana was such a staunch supporter of the Vaidica religion, that he wanted to make it the common religion of his subjects. For achieving this end, he imported on a large scale Brahmans from Brahmarshidêsa, the home of Hindu orthodoxy He extended to them his liberal patronage; and offered them his steady support in carrying on their propaganda by suppressing the heretical faiths of the Jainas and the Bauddhas whose temples he had destroyed, and whose settlements he had ruined.

The work of Karikâla, though similar to that of Trilôchana to a very great extent, is different from it in certain respects. Like Trilôchana, Karikâla was famous for the destruction of the forests, and the reclamation of large areas of forest land for the purposes of cultivation. He planted new villages in the reclaimed area, fostered their growth, and fixed their boun-

[1] S. I. I, VI. No. 211.

daries. At his instance many people of all communities migrated from Northern India and settled in them. He gave many agrahâras to Brahmans, and lands, temporarily free of tax, to the cultivators. When the colonists converted the forest area into arable land, he fixed the amount of tax which they had to pay to the government every year on their holdings. He took a permanent interest in the welfare of the agricultural population of his kingdom. He excavated tanks which he fed with the waters of streams whose courses he had diverted by building dams across them. Further, he grouped the new villages into nâḍus for the convenience of administration. He was a great builder; and he is credited with the construction of a large number of temples dedicated to Śiva, Vishṇu and other Purânic deities, which he richly endowed with grants of land.

The destruction of the forests, the reclamation of forest lands for agricultural operations, the plantation of colonies, the building of the temples and the grants of agrahâras to Brahmans and lands to cultivators show considerable similarity between the activities of these two monarchs. Of course, such similarity is to be expected when both of them had to do the same kind of work. Moreover, they appear to have adopted the traditional method of Aryan colonization. The various steps which the Aryan kings were expected to take while planting colonies are described by Kauṭilya in his Arthasâstra. He says,—

"Either by inducing foriegners to immigrate or by causing thickly populated centres of his own kingdom

to send forth excessive population, the king may construct villages either on new sites or on old ruins."

"Villages consisting each of not less than a hundred families and of not more than five hundred families of agricultural people of the sûdra caste.........shall be formed."

* * * *

"Those who perform sacrifices (ritvik), spiritual guides, priests, and those learned in the Vêdas shall be granted Brahmadêya lands yielding sufficient produce and exempted from taxes and fines.'

* * * *

"Lands prepared for cultivation shall be given to taxpayers only for life. Unprepared lands shall not be taken away from those who are preparing them for cultivation."

* * * *

"* * * Either on the occasion of opening new settlements or on any other emergent occasions remission of taxes shall be made."

"He shall regard with fatherly kindness those who have passed the period of remission of taxes."

* * * *

"He shall also construct reserviors (sêtu) filled with water either perennial or drawn from some other source. Or, he may provide with sites, roads, timber, and other necessary things those who construct reserviors of their own accord. Likewise in the construction of the places of pilgrimage and of groves."[1]

It appears from what has been said above that Trilôchana and Karikâla were preeminently aryanisers

[1] Arthasastra: Shama Sastri's translation, pp. 49-51.

of South India. They encouraged the migration, from Aryâvarta, of large numbers of Brahmans whom they induced to settle in their respective dominions by granting them agrahâras on a largs scale not only with the object of obtaining religious merit for themselves but for securing certain substantial benefits for their subjects. The agrahâras where these Northern Brahmans resided were centres of light and learning. They were the exponents of Aryan culture and civilization. The patronage which was extended to them by Karikâla and Trilôchana was intended to pave the way for the gradual aryanisation of South India.

Notwithstanding the close resemblance that exists between the work of Karikâla and Trilôchana, the former appears to have been more a prudent ruler who kept at heart the interest of the farmer and the land-owner than an idealist. The latter, on the otherhand, should be regarded more as a religious reformer who concentrated all his attention on the spiritual betterment of his subjects than as a sagacious statesman and skilful administrator. He was zealous in supporting the Brahmans in their attempts to establish the supremacy of the Aryan religion. The original faith of the land gradually lost its individuality, and was absorbed by Brahminism to spread which Trilôchana and his friends were straining every nerve.

APPENDIX 1.

Who is Trilôchana Pallava? and what is his place in the history of the Pallavas? These questions must be answered so that we may understand the history of the Pallavas properly. According to Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, he is 'a mythical ruler of Pallava origin who held sway over the Telugu country at some period of its history'.[1] This is the typical view current among scholars regarding the historicity of this king. This view goes against a large body of tradition, both epigraphical and literary. It is not at all reasonable to set it aside, unless there are strong reasons against its genuineness.

Trilôchana Pallava is mentioned in an inscription of the 10th century A. D: 'Śrîmân Îsvara Vamsajah Triṇayanah Kānchîpatih Pallavah.' 'Born in the Isvara vamsa was Triṇayana, the king of Kānchi, Pallava.'[2] The Raṇastipûṇḍi grant of Vimalâditya (1011) makes him a contemporary and rival of Vijayâditya, the founder of the Châḷukya dynasty. It is said that Trilôchana killed Vijayâditya in a battle. '*Vijayadityô nâma râjâ vijigîshayâ dakshinâpatham gatvâ Trilôchana Pallava madhikshipya daivadurîhayâ lokântaramgamat*'.[3] 'King Vijayâditya went to Dakshiṇâpatha, where he was opposed by Trilôchana Pallava, and went to the other world by an evil fate.' Again, a number of inscriptions in the Nellore district belonging to the 12th and 13th

[1] *Epigraphia Indika*, vol. xi. p. 340.
[2] *Epigraphia Carnatica*, vol. xi. Sira 28,
[3] *Epigraphia Indika*, vol. iii,

centuries make him a contemporary of the early Chôḷa king Karikâla. The common sentence that occurs in most of them is '*charana sarôruha vihita (vihata) vilôchana Trilôchana pramukhâkhila pridhivîsvara kārita kavêrîtira Karikâla* etc., which means: 'Karikâla who caused the banks of (the river) Kâvêri to be built by Trilôchana and other kings who fixed their glances on (his) lotus feet (*i.e.*, were subordinate to him)."[1] 'This Trilôchana Pallava,' says Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, 'is, perhaps identical with the Trilôchana of the Telugu Chôḍa inscriptions, and with Triṇayan Pallava and Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi of the Telugu epigraphs."[2] The terms, Trilôchana, Trinêtra, Triṇayana and Mukkanṭi are synonymous. The first three are Śânskṛit, and the last one is their Telugu equivalent; and all of them mean the same thing 'the three-eyed one.' It is interesting to note in this connexion that the name Mukkanṭi is always associated in the inscriptions with another name Kâḍuveṭṭi. The princes who caused these records to be inscribed call themselves Pallavas and derive their descent from Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi. Was Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi a Pallava? The name does not at all help us in any way: it simply means 'the three-eyed one who cut the forests.' Much light is thrown upon this problem by some Kânarese inscriptions. According to them, the terms Kāḍuvamahārāya and Kāḍuvamahādêvi are applied to the Pallava kings and queens respectively. Moreover, we understand from Ep. Car. vol. viii. Nagar 35 that the term Kâḍuveṭṭi was a biruda of all the Pallava kings of

---

[1] *Epigrapha Indika*, vol. xi.

[2] Ibid.

Kânchi. This inscription contains a long description of the Western Ganga dynasty; Here it is said of Durvinîta;

> 'Vasudhege Ravana-pratimanemba negertteya Kaduvettiyam - Visasana-rangadol pididu. etc.

'Having captured on the field of battle Kâḍuveṭṭi who is celebrated as Râvaṇa to this earth, etc.'

Of another Ganga King. Śrîpurusha it is said,—

> VRI || 'Sâtrava - samkula - pralaya - Bhairavan emba yasam podoldu lô- |
> katraya madhyadol pareye birada Kanchiya Kaduvettiyam |
> chitrav - idam chilardeyol asugole kâḍi tadiya Pallava |
> chchhatraman irdukondu meredam bhuja - garbbamanâ - mahîbhuja ||
>
> KA || A nripa chudamani Kan |
> chi nathana kayyol iruddukondam gada Per- |
> mmânadiya emb - î - pesaruman |
> ên embudo Ganga nripara sauryyonnatiyam ||.

'Fighting to death in a wonderful manner in Viḷarde (Chiḷarde) Kâḍuveṭṭi of warlike Kânchi, and taking away his Pallava Umbrella, that great king distinguished himself by the power of his arm. The crest jewel of kings took away from the hand of the Kânchi King, did he not, the name Permanadi?'

Of Rakkasa Ganga it is said,—

> 'Antu Sukhadim baleyuttirdda kanya ratnagal irbbarim piriya-Chattala-Dêviyam Tondenadu nâlvattenchhâsarikk adhipatiyum Kanchi-nadhanum Isvara-vara-prasâdanum Vrishabha lânchhananum enisida Kâduvettige Rakkasa-ganga-permânadi vivâhotsava mâdi Chattala-Dêvige Kâdava Mahâdevi Vattamam katti sukhadin irisidan.'

'And as those virgin-jewels grew up in happiness, Rakkasa-Ganga Permmânaḍi celebrated the marriage of the elder one, Chaṭṭala Dêvi to Kâḍuveṭṭi the ruler of Tonḍenâd Forty Eight Thousand, lord of Kânchi, obtainer of a boon from Isvara, having the bull crest—and binding on Chaṭṭala Dêvi, the crown of the Kâḍava Mahâdêvi, placed her in a happy condition.'

It is obvious from the above that the term Kâḍuveṭṭi is a title which was usually borne by the Pallava kings of Kânchi, lords of Tonḍenâd Forty Forty Eight Thousand. Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi therefore must be identical with Mukkanṭi or Triṇayana Pallava king of Kânchi. If we are right in assuming that Triṇayana Trinêtra, Trilôchana and Mukkanṭi are one and the same person, we may take for granted that he was the lord of an extensive kingdom consisting of Tondenâd, the territory up to the Krishna in the north and the Bellary and Anantapur districts in the west. It appears that we have to deal with a historical character rather than a mythical king, although we are not able to say with which of the early Pallava kings he can be identified.

Next, we have to determine the date of this Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi or Trilôchana Pallava. Tradition epigraphical as well as literary makes him the contemporary of two kings, Karikâla Chôḷa and Vijayâditya whose dates unfortunately have not yet been fixed. The Châḷukya king Pulakêsin I, the great grandson of Vijayâditya lived about 550 A.D., granting twenty years for each generation, we may arrive at (550—60) = 490 A.D., as the probable date of Vijayâditya. If we agree with the epigraphist in thinking that 'the three kings Karikâla, Vijayâditya, and Trilôchana Pallava were almost contemporaries,'[1] we must assign Karikâla and Trilôchana to the same period.

There are some writers who object very strongly to this view. Dr. S. K. Iyengar rejects the tradition as 'flimsy.' He does not think that Trilôchana could have

[1] *Epigraphic Indica*, vol. xi.

been a contemporary of Karikâla. According to the Tamil literature of the so called Sangam age, Karikâla is said 'to have destroyed forests to make arable country out of them.' 'It is the fact of this reclamation of the forest country that has led to the connexion between Karikâla and Trilôchana Pallava.'[1] The argument here advanced is very unconvincing; one fails to understand why a tradition embodied in so many inscriptions belonging to different times and places should be set aside on such questionable grounds. If Dr. S. K. Iyengar had no preconceived theory regarding the date of Karikâla, he would not have advanced this argument to set aside an ancient tradition.

Moreover, the Telugu literary tradition also makes Trilôchana Pallava a contemporary of Karikâla. The poet Tikkana, who was the prime minister of the Andhra Chôḍa King Manuma Siddhi of Nellore (1214-15) has the following verse in his Nirvachana Uttara Rāmāyaṇa.

శా॥ చేసేతం బృథివీశు లందఱు నొసంగా సింధుతోయంబులం
జేసెన్ మజ్జనముం గుతూహలమునం జేసెన్ బలాత్పల్లవు
ద్వారం బొందఁగ ఫాలలోచనము దీర్ణంగ్లైఁ గావేరికిం
గాసాధ్యోర్వీపతిజిత్వరుండు కరికా - లక్ష్మాధిపుం డల్పుడే ॥

'Is the King Karikâla who bathed in the waters of the Ganges passed on to him in pails from the hands of his subordinate kings; who with ease deprived the Pallava King of *his eye in the forehead* (ఫాలలోచన); who built the embankments of the Kâvêri, and who conquered all the kings of the earth; is he an ordinary king?' There are four of Karikâla's

[1] S. K. Iyengar: *The Pallavas*.

achievements enumerated in this verse. (1) The bathing in the waters of the Ganges. This refers to his invasion of Northern India. (2) The depriving the Pallava king of his third eye. This refers to his victory over Trilôchana Pallava. (3) The construction of the embankments of the Kâvêri. This establishes that the Karikâla of N. U. R. is the same as the Karikâla of the Sangam literature. (4) And the conquest of all the neighbouring kings.

Here, we have to meet the arguments of an objector. Mr. T. G. Arvâmudan who has examined this question with much ingenuity and skill, has come to the conclusion that Karikâla and Trilôchana Pallava or Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi were not contemporaries. The Kaḷingattuppariṇi of Jayamgoṇḍan, a poet of the court of Kuḷôttunga I (1070-1120) contains a stanza which when translated reads as follows:

'(He recorded further) how (Karikâlan) directed a portrait to be drawn of Mukari who had not followed (the others) to the Kâvêri, the banks of which were being made by the kings who had made obeisance (to him) and how looking at it and saying "this is a superfluous eye," he rubbed it out here and (lo!) it was extinguished there.'[1]

Mr. Arvâmudan reconstructs the story thus: 'A call went forth from Karikâlan to the peoples and princes subordinate to him, and among them to Mukari too—quite probably a feudatory prince to help in the building of the embankments of the Kâvêri, and the fiat went forth that the feudatory princes were to carry

[1] T. G. Arvamudan: *The Kaveri, Maukharis*, etc.

earth just as the common labourers did. Mukari did not turn up, though others did. On Karikâlan being informed of Mukari's absence, he directed a portrait of him to be painted so that he might apprise the man aright, and, on being satisfied from an examination of it that Mukari was by nature given to contumaciousness, and that his absence must therefore have been of set purpose, Karikâlan ordered that Mukari's eyes were put out by way of punishment. No sooner was the sentence pronounced than it was executed. Or, a slight variation may be that Karikâlan had a portrait prepared for use in some practice of witchcraft by which he procured the instant, the blinding of Mukari's eyes.'[1]

The commentary on the verse is highly unconvincing, though imaginative. Karikâla is made to follow a very queer procedure in punishing Mukari. It appears to be a desperate attempt to convert a legend into history.

Having thus commented upon the verse, he next attempts to discover who Mukari was. He asks the question, 'could any one of the name of Trilôchana, Trinêtra, Triṇayana, or Mukkanṭi—whoever might have borne these names, though they had chosen names quite synonymous—have been our Mukari?'[2] After a lengthy discussion he arrives at the conclusion that the Mukari of Kaḷingattuppariṇi is not the Mukkanṭi Pallava of the inscriptions. Therefore, he travels all the way to Northern India in search of this eluding king. I think that all this trouble is uncessary. It is possible to catch him somewhere in South India itself.

The Mukari tradition of the Tamil literature dates from the latter half of the twelfth century. According

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

to the verse in the Kaḷingattuppariṇi, Mukari had a 'superfluous eye,' i.e., one eye more than the usual number. Therefore the Mukari of Kaḷingattuppariṇi was a person with three eyes. The Trilôchana Pallava tradition of the Telugu literature dates from the first decade of the thirteenth century. The Pallava king of the Nirvachana Uttara Râmâyaṇa had three eyes. In both the cases, it was King Karikâla that destroyed the third eye. The epigraphical records of the period make Trilôchana the king who was deprived of his eye by Karikâla. Thus we have an inscription of Manumasiddhi (Nellore K. V. 13) which opens with, స్వస్తిచరణ సరోరుహ విహితవిలోచన త్రిలోచన ప్రముఖాఖిల పృథివీశ్వర కారిత కావేరీతీర కరికాల కుల రత్న ప్రదీప, which means 'of the race of Karikâla whose lotus feet blinded the eyes of Trilôchana and other kings building the embankments of the Kâvêri, etc."[1] Another inscription[2] (O. 128) of 1118-19 contains the phrase విహిత విలోచన త్రిలోచన as adjectives to Karikâla. Thus the earliest inscriptions containing this phrase date from 1118-19 A.D. As Kuḷottunga Choḷa I, the patron of Jayamgoṇḍan ruled until 1120 A.D., we may be justified in concluding that the Telugu tradition appears to be as old as the Tamil tradition.

In addition to these, a Telugu poem of the fourteenth century called Navachôḷa Charitra, which has been recently brought to light, throws much new light upon the problem. It contains the story of a king of Kâḷahasti called Mukkanṭi Chôḍa who was a contemporary of Krikâla. Although he is called a Chôḍa in

---

[1] Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty: Nellore District Inscriptions.

[2] Ibid.

the poem, Mukkanṭi had no connexion with the Chôḷas. He was commanded by Karikâla to assist him in constructing the embankments of the Kâvêri. Mukkanṭi who was an independent king was naturally angry, and expelled the envoys from his court. They returned to the court of Karikâla and told him what had happened. Thereupon, he went to the temple of Siva of whom he was a great devotee, and requested him to put out the third eye of Mukkanṭi. The God complied with his devotee's request. Here is the story:

The son of a Virgin: On one occasion, the women of Kaḷahasti, went to the local temple of Śiva to worship the god. When the service was completed, they extended their hands to receive the prasâda, which the priests were distributing among the devotees. Among the women that were present, there was a girl who also extended her hands like others to receive the prasâda. Her sisters-in-law who were present prayed to the god requesting him to bestow on the young girl a son. The god heard their prayer, and gave them the desired boon. The girl went home with her sisters-in-law. A few months later, it was found that she was carrying. This naturally created a scandal. When her parents reproached her with bad conduct, she pleaded her innocence before them, and told them what had taken place. She declared that she became pregnant by the grace of Śiva, and that she was going to beget a son with three eyes, which would prove her innocene, and Śiva's fatherhood of her child at the same time. Her parents resolved to wait until the birth of the child. After the completion of the ninth month, she gave birth to a son with three eyes. Consequently, he was named Mukkanṭi, ' the

three-eyed.' The girl-mother brought up her child with much care and affection.

Mukkanti discovers his father: As Mukkanṭi grew up into manhood, his desire to know his father also increased. One day, he went to his mother, and asked her to tell him who his father was. She described the circumstances under which he was born, and told him that the god Śiva was his father. Then, he went to his father, the Śiva of Śrî Kâḷahasti, offered him worship, and asked him the following questions: 'Is it fair, O. Mahâdêva, that, although I was born to you, I should lead the unhonoured life of an ordinary mortal? Why don't you have mercy on me?' The merciful Śiva heard him, and appeared before him. He gave him much wealth and a strong army; built him a city, and made him the ruler of an extensive kingdom. Then the god blessed him, and disappeared finally. Mukkanṭi became the ruler of a prosperous kingdom. He beautified his capital by adorning it with new buildings.

Mukkunti and Karikala: Then came the envoys from the court of Karikâla, the famous Chôḷa King, and said, 'King Karikâla, who is building the enbankments of the holy Kâvêri requires you to go to him to assist him in his work.' Mukkanṭi became indignant. He said, 'I am a devotee of Śiva: I am a kiug; I have three eyes indicative of my power. Has that Chôḷa king forgotten himself so far as to ask me to attend to his domestic work? Does he not know the prowess and ability of king Mekkanṭi Chôḍa? I must not get angry with you who are his envoys; go away from this place at once.

The ambassadors replied that their king was powerful and that Mukkanṭi should not make an enemy of him, while other kings were serving him in person. Thereupon, his wrath was thoroughlly ruosed by the audacity of the envoys. He had them expelled from his court by his servants. They returned to the court of Karikâla, and told him what had happened. Karikâla said, 'I am constructing the embankments of the Kâvêri by the command of Śiva. All the kings of the earth have come to assist me. Is it becoming of Mukkanṭi to refuse to come? His refractory attitude towards me is the result of the third eye which is the source of his power; so long as he has this eye, he will not come, and the work will not be completed.' So saying he repaired to the temple of Śiva and said:

'Because of his third eye which in your affection you bestowed upon Mukkanṭi Chôḍa, he disobeys our command and opposes us. O God, take away his third eye. We place on you the injunction (ఆన) of your bhaktas.[1] Then Karikâla went home, and was absorbed in the work of constructing the embankments.

Meanwhile, the third eye of Mukkanṭi disappeared, and he became thoroughly alarmed. He at once repaired toŚiva's temple, and asked him,—

'Why, O God, do you play tricks upon me? I have become famous as Mukkanṭi Chôḍa. Now, my third eye is gone, and I stand dishonoured and powerless. Why have you taken away the eye in my forehead which you yourself bestowed on me? What crime have I committed? Am I not your son and bhakta?'

The God appeared before him, and said: ' King Karikâla is constructing the embankments of the Kâvêri. All kings asist him in his work. You alone had refused to help him, although you were invited. He begged me to deprive you of your third eye to punish you for your disobedience. I cannot refuse to comply with the request of my bhakta, go to him, he will restore your third eye.' The God vanished, and Mukkanṭi went to Karikâla who recieved him with much respect. Then he prayed to Śiva to restore his eye to Mukkanṭi, which the God did. Mukkanṭi thus got back his eye. He became greater than ever and remained a firm ally and friend of Karikâla.

This is the story of Mukkanṭi as described in the Nava Chôḍa Charitra As the object of the book is to narrate the stories of nine Chôḷa royal saints, it describes many miraculous events most of which are useless for the purposes of history. The legend that has been described above shows: (1) that Mukkanṭi Chôḍa (Pallava?) was a conremporary of Karikâla Chôḷa; (2) that the Mukari whose 'superflouous eye' was blinded by Karikâla was not a king of Northern India, but Mukkanṭi Chôḍa, Mukkanṭi Kâduveṭṭi or Trilôchana Pallava. Thus we see that Trilôchana Pallava according to tradition, was a contemporary of Karikâla and Vijayâditya. Since we approximately estimated the time of Vijayâditya as the beginning of the Sixth Century A.D, we may also suppose that the other two lived about the same time.

APPENDIX 2.

I concluded my article on this subject in the April number of the Magazine thus : 'The legend that has been described above shows : (1) that Mukkanṭi Chôḍa (Pallava ?) was a contemporary of Krikâla Chôḷa ; (2) that the Mukari whose 'superfluous eye' was blinded by Karikâla was not a king of Northern India, but Mukkanṭi Chôḍa, Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi or Trilôchana Pallava.' These conclusions are corroborated by a passage of Panḍitârâdhya Charita, a poem of Pâlkurki Sôma who lived from 1170 to 1230 A.D. The passage of the Panḍitârâdhya Charita is the earliest literary reference to the subject in Telugu ; moreover, it is as old as the passage in the Kaḷingattuppariṇi. The passage runs thus :

“పిల యుట్టిద చేరుం జెప్ప ముక్కంటి
కా౯ (వు) పెట్టిమొదలైన గణనాథుడేకము
మిక్కుటంబుగ తొలి మేనిపుణ్యమున
ముక్కంటితోడన ముక్కు జన్మించి
మేదురభక్తి మెయిమించి లోకముల
నాదిత్యాస్త్రి నెరయుచుండెడిమనంద
కరిగాలచోడని గణనాయకుండు
నరిదిరభక్తి ప్రవర్తనశాలి
* * * * * *
ఒక్ర మరిలకాలికెగట్టు మను
ముట్టిన మరిరామ్రైముక్కంటికా౯ (వు)
పెట్టినా కాటిని పెట్టికిదెలయ
ముక్కంటివాడేలమున పెట్టి చేయుం
ముక్కంటివానికి చే చేయవనుండు;

ఇచ్చినవాఁడెవ్వఁడీ నేత్రమనుచు
నచ్చుగా ముక్కన్నునతనిరూపంబు
ముంగల వ్రాయించి మొగిదనకాలి
యుంగుటంబున నటురొత్త ముక్కంటి
కాళి (డు) వెట్టినా నటికన్నుటుబుకఁగ
కాళివెట్టిన యహంకారంబడంగి
కరికాల చోడవిక్రమచక్రవర్తి
కరయసాష్టాంగుఁడై యట బ్రణమిల్లి
కరికాలచోడుని కరుణాతిశయతి
బరఁగంగ ముక్కన్ను బడసె ....”

—Paṇḍitârâdhya Charita, ch. IV.

'What is the use of enumerating a thousand instances of this kind? There was a king called Mukkaṇṭi Kâḷi [ḍu]veṭṭi, who was born with a third eye in virtue of his meritorious deeds in a former birth. His devotion to Siva was very great. People used to think that he was God Siva himself. King Karikâla Chôḷa who was growing great in his devotion to Siva was building the embankments to the river Kâvêri. He wanted that Mukkaṇṭi should go and help him in rising the embankments. Mukkaṇṭi refused to go, and said, 'why should a man with three eyes, serve another who has only two eyes? I will not go.' Karikâla grew indignant. He said, '*who gave him this third eye?' and had an exact likeness of him with his third eye drawn on the ground efore him; and with one of his toes pressed hard the third eye of the picture. Thereupon the third eye of Mukkanti burst out; and he was humbled.* He then went to the court of the glorious Chôḷa emperor, Karikāla, and recovered his lost third eye by his grace.'

The events described in this passage are the same as those mentioned in Kaḷingattupparaṇi. Moreover, it leaves no doubt about the identity of the person whose eye Karikâla put out. It declares that this person is Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi or Triḷôchana Pallava. Therefore, the Mukari of Kaḷingattupparaṇi is none other than Mukkanṭi Kâḍuveṭṭi. This passage establishes it once for all.

There is another point which is yet to be considered. How are we to account for the name Mukari which occurs in Tamil books in this context? It does not appear to have anything to do with the Maukharis of Northern India. Mukari appears to be an old Dravidian word which has long ago passed out of the current language. There is, however, a river in Southern Telugu country called Svarṇamukhi or Swarṇamukhari.

This is the Sânskṛitized from of its original vernacular name. This river is referred to in Tamil as *Pon-Mukari.*[1] It is 'interesting to note that Swarṇa Mukhari or Pon-Mukari flows by the side of the town of Kâḷahasti, which, according to the Nava Chôḍa Charita was the capital of the king whose third eye was put out by Karikâla. It seems, therefore, probable that this king was referred to as Mukari, because he ruled over the territority extending along the banks of the river Mukari.

[1] 'Mukari occurs in Tamil as the name of a river, in the combination Pon-mukari,—" the golden-mukari" or "the golden gurgling stream"—the word being used in its primary significance of ',noise-maker."Mr T. G. Aravamudan, *The Kaveri, The Maukharis and The Sangam Age*. p. 24.

List of kaifiyats containing references to Mukkanti and Karikâla.

Schedule A.

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
1	Kôta (Nellore Dt.) ...	Refers to Tondaman Chakravarti who ruled about S 513. He cleared the forest for 30 miles from Kâlahasti to the sea; founded villages especially Kôta. His son was Mukkanti.		The dynasty of Mukkanti was followed by Nandana Chakravarti. He was succeeded by the Jaina kings of Kânchî. Then came the Chôlas.
2	Pottapi (Cudappah) ...		When Karikâla Chôla Mahârâja was ruling, there was a dense forest in the neighbourhood of the Karigiri Hill. He had the forests cleared, and founded new villages of which Pottapi was the most important. All the villages were constituted into a province which was called Pottapinâdu after the most important village in the locality.	
3	Siriyavaram do. ...	A fragment of an inscription containing the name of Mukkanti Kaduvetti.	......	

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
4	Bommavaram (Cudappah.)		The site on which the village stands is said to have been a forest during the reign of Karikâla Chôla.	
5	Sara (Karnûl) ...	Pallavâdhisvara who reigned after Kali 2000 founded the village of Chennûr on the banks of the Pinâkini near Cudappah. He had a tank excavated. This king had also the name of Trilôchana Pallava. He is said to have founded the village of Peda Mudium which he granted to the Brahmans as an agrahara in Kali 1540. The village was also known as Trilôchanapura.		కలియుగద్విసహస్రాబ్దే పినాకినీతీరే చ దక్షిణ తటాకగ్రామనామ్నాయాం పల్లవాధీశనిర్మితే. విక్రమాబ్ధిబాణచంద్రాబ్దే విధిశేష్ఠీకరాయుగే త్రిలోచనమహారాజస్త్రిలోచనపురం దదౌ.
6	Sindavâdi (Bellary) ...		Certain events are said to have taken place during the reign of Karikâla Chôla Mahârâja.	
7	Nyayakallu (Bellary) ...		When Karikâla Chôla was reigning, he built 101 temples to Siva; determined the boundaries of the village, and gave it as an agrahâra to Siva, dêvas, and Brahmans.	Contains the story regarding Karikâla's sin of 'killing the Brahman.'

8	Siriguppa (Bellary) ...		Karikâla is mentioned as one of the kings who ruled over the place.	
9	Duvvur (Çudappah) ...		During the reign of Mahârâja Karikâla Chôla, the country was covered with forest in the midst of which, there were a few hamlets of recluses, and of hunters who lived on birds and beasts hunted by them.	
10	Zullur (Pithâpuram) ...	Contains the familiar story which describes the death of the Châlukyan adventurer Vijayâditya at the hands of Trilôchana Pallava.		
11	Bandar (Krishna) ...	The city is said to have been founded by Mukkanti Mahârâja. The Bhavundas and the Jangamas were the priests employed to worship Siva in his temples. It used to be conducted contrary to the Vedic injunctions. Mukkanti summoned an assembly of Brahmans and explained to them, that in the Siva temples, services should thenceforward be conducted, as in the temples of Vishnu, in accordance with the Vedic regulations. Brahman priests were substituted for the non-Brahman priests.		

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
12	Chandavôlu (Guntur).		The kaifiyat describes what is alleged to have taken place after the beginning of the Saka era. It gives us a list of Chôla kings. Karikâla was born to Vira Vikrama Chôla by the grace of Siva. He conquered Mukkanti and other Kings and built a dam across the Kâvêri.	The list of Cholas is this:— Ahobala Chola | Dhavalanga Mudigonda | Viravikrama | Karikala
13	Chittivel (Cudappah).		After many years had passed in this way, Karikâla Mahârâja of the Solar dynasty ascended the throne. He came conquering from the west, annexed this country; he had the forest cleared on the southern side of the Karigiri hill, where he founded Pottapi and some other villages. As Pottapi was the most important of all of them, the whole group acquired the the name of Pottapinâdu. To the south of Pottapi, there extended a dense forest as far as the holy Tirumalai. In the midst of this forest, there flourished a few hamlets of munis. Karikâla had the forest cleared, and planted new villages, which, from the	

			innumerable birds living in the region, acquired the name of Pulugula-nâdu.	
14	Kâmalâpuram (Cudappah.)		Karikâla and his descendants are said to have built some temples here.	
15	Kondur do. ...		Karikâla is said to have built a temple and dedicated it to Siva.	Story of Brahmahatya is also referred to.
16	The Kaifiyat of the Palli community.	Moreover, his (Karikâla's) servants went to the great city of Dharanikôta. Mukkanti, who obtained by the grace of Siva, a third eye, is said to have declared that he had three eyes and that he would not serve a man who had only two eyes. When Karikâla heard these insolent words, he had Mukkanti's likeness drawn on the ground, and pressed with his toe its third eye. Mukkanti lost his eye in the forehead; then he went to Karikâla and served him.		
17	The Story of the Nandavarikas at Chaudesvari Nandavaram (Cudappah).	After Kali 1570, Trilôchana paid a visit to Benares for the purpose bathing in the holy Ganges. At the time of the bath, there collected a large gathering of Brahmans at the		By the side of the present Mudivêmu, there is a big mound of earth, where ancient gold pieces are said to be found after the rains. This is believed to be the

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
		(Contd.) ghat. While he was giving the 16 great gifts, some Brahmans crowded round him, and requested him to grant them an agrahâra. He complied with the request of 108 Brahmans belonging to 18 gotras that were there, and asked them to choose the locality where they wanted to have the agrahâra. They mentioned the neighbourhood of the Srî Parvata as a suitable place. The king brought them with him to the centre of his kingdom, and had the forest cleared for 20 miles to the west of Ahôbala in the Nallamalais connected with the Sêshachala mountain which is an offshoot of the Srî Parvata. Here, he founded a new village, built houses, planted gardens, and secured cultivable land which he gave to the Brahmans. The village had two streets one higher in level than the other. The upper street was called Trilôchana Pura after the king; and the lower was named		site of ancient Trilôchanapura. It appears that there still stands the temple of Mukkantisvara.

		Mridâniyâ after the goddess Mridâni who had a temple there. There was also a Siva temple in the upper street. The god was known as Mukkantisvara after Mukkanti, a well-known name of the king. Thus, the Brahmans of 108 vrittis were in the enjoyment of the agrahâra. In course of time, the upper street was destroyed by a dust storm, and the people migrated to Mridamiyam, which was later corrupted into Mudivêmu.		
18	Santa Râvûr (Guntûr).	After this, there was an ascendency of the Jaina kings who ruled this country for a long time. Then came Mukkanti who was born by the grace of Siva. He destroyed the Buddhists, the Jainas, and the Charvakas, and conqured the country which he ruled for a long time.		Refers to his attainments as a Siddha which enabled him to visit the holy Ganges everyday for the purpose of bathing.
19	Upputur (Guntûr) ...	After 1986 Kali, King Mukkanti with his wife used to pay by his magical powers daily visits to Kâsi for the purpose of bathing in the holy waters of the Ganges, and worshipping Visvanath and other deities. On one day, after discharging all his religious duties at Benares,		There is an inscription which contains the story mentioned in the kaifiyat. It was not inscribed in the time of Mukkanti and it does not profess to be an inscription of his. It records the boundaries of and vrittis in the village. It was a late

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
		(Contd.) he desired to return to his capital Dharanikota. He, however, discovered that he lost his magic shoes. They were hidden by the God Bhairava whom he neglected to honour. Thinking that he could return home with the aid of the Brahmans, he approached them and explained to them his plight. By their assistance he recovered his magic shoes, and desiring to reward them adequately, he asked them to name anything which they might desire. Having discovered by their Yogic powers, that a famine, of 12 years duration would affect their land, they requested him to give them protection then. Mukkanti, having agreed to do so, said that he would unite 100 villages into a single village which he would grant them as a sarvamanya agrahara. The Brahamans, thereupon blessed him, and he returned to his capital, Dharanikōta. Soon after the famine came, and 1000		document; but it tells us the circumstances under which the Brahmans of Upputur obtained that agrahara. జయతిన(?)ఆర్యావర్తే జయ త్యహింస్రక ప్రథమ విప్రప్రోక్తోజయతి బ్రహ్మాద్యైక త్రినయనపల్లవో మహీపతి స్సర్వజ్ఞః. జయతిన వైదికమార్గే జయతి ప్రాగ్ హారస ప్తశతం జయతి ద్విజవరనికరో జయంతి వేద మహా ప్రభావాస్సతతం. ద్విసహస్ర కలాప్రాప్తే సతి శ్రీ పూర్వసాగరే తత్ర బ్రహ్మ ప్రతిష్ఠాస్తు కృతవాన్ త్రినేత్ర పల్లవః.

		Brahaman families first migrated to the banks of the Narmada. Having bathed in the river they picked up a linga, and continued their journey until they reached the Krishna. As the river was swollen with floods they did not desire to cross it; but sent information of their arrival to the king: but as the king sent word to them that they should cross the river by their magical powers, they prayed to the goddess Ganga and having crossed the river, came to the court of the king to see him. The king who was greatly pleased with them gave them the village tof Upputur (a union of one hundred villages) as a sarvamânya agrahara. Moreover, he built a temple of Siva in which he installed the linga which they brought from the Narmada, and gave it the name Amarêsvara. He also built temples for Padambika and Vighnesvara.		సహ ప్రసంఖ్యా కవి ప్రవరేభ్యో యాజ్ఞవల్క్యేభ్యో బ్రాహ్మణేభ్యః త్రినేత్రపల్లవో మహారాజాల వణగ్రామా అర్ధోదయ మహా పుణ్యకాలే పూర్వాహ్ణకాలే పూర్వయామే వితీర్ణాః. యావచ్చంద్రశ్చ సూర్యశ్చ యావత్తిష్ఠతి మేదినీ తావత్కాలేమయాదత్తః త్రినేత్ర పదసేవినా.
20	Talpagiri (Nellore) ...	Mukkanti is said to have been born to a Brahman virgin by the grace of Siva.		c/o the inscription of Budha I తతః శ్రీతో భూసురకన్యకా యాం జాతస్త్రినేత్రో హ్యాణి మాదిసిద్ధః &c., also Nava-chôadcharitra.

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
21	Sankurâtripâdu (Guntur).	After Kali 2000 had passed away, Mukkanti Mahârâja gave agraharas to 700 Brahmans that came from Kâsi. Moreover, he granted 7 villages as agraharas in honnour of the 7 rishis to 7 Brahmans who were as saintly as they. Solasa was given as an agrahara in honour of Bhardvaja.		
22	Mandrêdu (Guntur) ...	After the commencement of the Kali era, Trinêtra Pallava Maharaja who had the banner, Khatwanga went to the sea for bathing. Having found the place very charming, he built a city called Navanidhana and lived in it; but a few years later it was submerged under the sea.		The Pallava Kings of Kanchi had the Khatwânga banner. cf. the Conjeevaram inscription of Vikramâditya II.
23	Môtupalli (Krishna) ...	In the Kaliyuga, after the commencement of the Sâlivâhana era, Trinêtra Pallava or Mukkanti Mahârâja who was born by the grace of Siva, having the conquered of all quarters, became the overlord		

		of many countries. He granted 700 agrahâras to Brahmans; and he was in the habit of bathing in the waters of the Ganges everyday. While he was governing the earth in this fashion, from Dharanikôta, the Buddhists came to this place, built a city called Dvelânagara, and a temple of Buddha surrounded by prâkâra, and instaled the images of Buddhist deities within its precincts. The Buddhists were governing this city. Mukkanti having ruined them by religious disputations, came to this place for bathing in the sea. He improved this city, named it Mukulânagara, or Môtupalli after his own name, gave many gifts to Brahmans and built temples for Kodandaramaswami and Mallikêsvara. Mukkanti reigned for many years, and after him, the city was submerged under the sea.		
24	Kârasâla ...	Mukkanti Mahâraja destroyed Jainas, Banddhas, and Charvakas and imported Brahmans from the Gangetic Valley and granted them 700 agraharas. Besides, he granted 7 agraharas in honour of 7 Rishis. Upputur was granted in honour of		

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
		(Contd.) Vasishta, Vangipura in honour of Atri; Kârambêdu in honour of Bharadwâja, Solasa in honour of Gautama; Guntur in honour of Jamadagni; and Ingallu in honour of Visvâmitra. He built three temples dedicated to Vishnu and one to Mallesvara, and had a tank excavated to the north of the village,		
25	Yâbuti (Guntur) ...	In the neighbourhood of this village, there was a centre of the Buddhists called Buddham. Mukkanti who was born by the grace of Siva, destroyed the teachers of the Jainas, and Bauddhas and made himself master of the country.		
26	Yerragudi (Guntur) ...		Karikâla is said to have built some temples in the village.	An allusion to the story of Karikâla's wanderings on account of the sin of 'Brahmahatya'.
27	Inagallu (Guntur) ...	Mukkanti born by the grace of Rudra granted 700 agraharas to Brahmans who migrated from Northern India. Besides,		

		he granted seven villages as "Sapta rishi the agraharas" in honour of the seven rishis. Of them Upputûr was granted in honour of Vasistha; Kâram-bêdu of Atri; Guntur of Gautama; Solasa of Bharadvâja; Karubola of Visvâmitra; Vangipura of Kasyapa; and Inagallu of Jamadagni. In this fashion, after Kali 2000 years had expired, Mukkanti Mahârâja created Brahman establishments, and gave Inagallu as an agrahara to the Brahmans in honour of Jamadagni. These events took place in the era of Yudhisthira.		
28	Rêtur (Guntur) ...	To the South-east of the present village of Rêtûr, during the time of the Jaina rulers, there was a village called Kandrâjupâdu where there was a basadi of the Jainas. During the reign of Mukkanti, there was a religious desputation between the Jainas and the Brahmans who migrated from Kâsi. The Jainas were defeated, and the basadi at Kandrajupadu was destroyed.		
29	Chadipirêla ...		Karikâla is said to have visited the place, and, after clearing	

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
			Contd.) the forest, built a temple over a linga which was hidden in an anthill.	
30	Pattavirâvi ...		While Karikâla Chôla Mahâraja was reigning the earth, he visited this place. Having discovered the traces of an old village, he founded a new village on the site and built a number of temples to diverse gods.	
31	Râvulakolanu ...		That village came into prominence during the reign of Karikâla Chôla, who gave it the name of Ravulakolanu. A portion of the land of the village was made cultivable by clearing the forest even before his time. He induced the ryots of the village to pay the government a suitable annual tax upon the cultivable fields.	
32	Gullamalli ...		Karikala is said to have built a temple of Siva in this place.	
33	Chundur ...	The reign of Mukkanti is alluded to.		

34	Anantavaram (Guntûr).	In the Kali era, after Mâdhavavarman had passed away, Mukkanti was born by the grace of Siva. He induced Brâhmans who acquired much power through *tapas* to migrate to South India, and made arrangements for their permanent residence in the country. He destroyed the Jainas, the Bauddhas and the Charvakas, and reigned until S 220 having Dharanikota and Warangal as his capitals.	After this, Karikala Chôla and others ruled the earth for a long time.	
35	Annavaram (Guntûr)...	An allusion to the reign of Mukkanti.		
36	Tûmunûru ...	do.		
37	Lempalle ...		Karikala is said to have built a temple here.	
38	Avudûr ...	In Kali 3642 corresponding to the cyclic year Durmati which fell in S 463, Tripurantaka Mahadeva was ruling at Penugonda.		Kali 3642 or S 463 is too early a date for Tripurantaka deva who lived in 13th century A. D. Tripurantaka appears to have been confounded with Trinêtra. This information has no value.
39	Châvali ...	The reign of Mukkanti is alluded to.		

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
40	Kollûru (Guntur) ...	While Trinêtra Pallava or Mukkanti who was born by the grace of Siva, having selected Dharanîkôta as his capital, was governing the earth, some Jainas were living in a village called Nâgarâjupâdu to the west of the present village of Kollûru.		After the commencement of the Şalivâhana era, the Jaina emperor Kirtivarman governed this country. His discendants Vikramarka, Jayasimha, Malladeva, Somadeva, Perummadideva, Singhadeva, Vishnuvardhana of Vengi and other Jaina kings ruled it.
41	Vuratûr (Cuddapah) ...		Karikala is said to have built three temples here, and endowed them with lands.	
42	Kommaddi (Cudappah)		It refers to a Chola Mahârâja who came from the Southern country for the purpose of conquest.	This must be Karikâla, for at this early period, we are not aware of any other Chôla king who invaded the Cudappah Distritc from the South.
43	Bêtampalli ...		It refers to the reign of Karikala.	
44	Juvvalapalli ...		do.	
45	Pushpagiri (Cudappah).		Karikala is said to have built some temples in the place. He granted also an agrahara to some Brahmans who cured him of a fever at Kasi on a former occasion.	

46	Brahmanapalle (Cudappah).		At a kshêtra called Kusumâchala some Brahmans established themselves in permanent homesteads during the reign of Karikala Chôla Mahârâja. He had a huge tank excavated to the west of the village; and he built a dam across a streamlet so that the tank might be supplied with water.	
47	Pêrâla (Guntur) ...	While Mukkanti was returning to Dharanikôta, after his bath in the sea, where he granted 7 agraharas to 7 Brahmans in honour of the Seven Rishis, he saw some idols standing in the open near a lake at Pêrâla. Having understood that the place was sanctified by the *rishis*, he built for the idols temples which he endowed with lands.		
48	Vangipuram (Guntur).	In Kali 1986, while king Mukkanti with his wife was bathing in the waters of the Ganges at Kâsi, his magic shoes disappeared. However, he recovered them with the aid of the Brahmans, who having a fore-knowledge of a great famine in the future, requested him to give them protection at that time. The king promised; and they parted company. Four		

No.	Name of the Kaifiyat.	On Mukkanti.	On Karikala.	Remarks.
		(Contd.) years after the return of Mukkanti to his capital, Dharanikôta, famine visited the land of Kâsi. Therefore the Brahmans and their families immigrated to this country. Mukkanti Mahârâja honoured them greatly, and granted them 700 agraharas. Besides, seven more agraharas were also granted by him in honour of the seven great rishis. Upputur was granted in honour of Vasistha, Kârambêdu in honour of Atri, Inagallu in honour of Jamadagni, Guntûr in honour of Gautama, Solasa in honour of Bhardvâja, Kârubolu in honour of Viswâmitra, and Vangîpura in honour Kasyapa. Mukkanti Mahârâja established Brahman settlements in this fashion after Kali 2000 on the coast of the Eastern Sea; and he made Vangîpura an agrahara in honour of the sage Kasyapa.		

B.—*Table showing the inscriptions in which the donors say that they renewed an original grant by Mukkanti Kâduvetti or Trilochana Pallava.*

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Name of the King.	Date.	Dynasty.	Village.	Taluk.	District.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	N.D.I.	I.D. 2.	Vikramaditya I. ...	S. 582(?)	Western Chalukya.	Annavaram.	Darsi.	Nellore.	About 660 A.D.
2	The Andhra Bhârati of Masulipatam	1918 (Vol 8 No. 12.)	Malla Vishnu-vardhana.	S. 1101	Eastern Chalukya.	Erarupalli.	...	Krishna.	A.D. 1179.
3	L.R.	Vol. 42.	Kakati Ganapati ...	S. 1131	Kakatiya.	Idupula-pâdu.	...	Guntur.	A.D. 1209.
4	Rep. Epi. 1908.	A.R. 580 of 1907.	Manuma Siddha II.	S. 1179	Telugu Choda.	Nandalur.	Rajampet.	Cuddap-pah.	A.D. 1257.
*5	S.I.I.	VI. 228.	Kôta Mahârâja.	S. 1119	Kôta.	Amaravati.	Sattena-palli.	Guntur.	A.D. 1197.

*This inscription is important. It tells us that Keta of the Kôta family renewed the charters of the seven agraharas (1) Guntur (2) Solasala Mirru (3) Korchera (4) Vangipura (5) Inumgallu (6) Upputur (7) Karemchêdu, originally granted to Brahmans by *Mukkanti Kaduvetti*. This inscription confirms the statement of the Local Records which assert that the villages mentioned above were given as agraharas to Brahmans in honour of the Seven Rishis by Mukkanti.

C. *Table showing the inscriptions the donors of which claim to be the descendants of Mukkanti Kaduvetti or Trilochana Pallava.*

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Name of the King.	Date Saka Year.	Village.	Taluk	District.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	S.I.I.	VI. 361	Diliparasa, Nolamba ...	864	Hemavati ...	Madakasira ..	Anantapur
2	N.D.I. II.	U. 6	S. M. Nandivarma Maharaja ...	1024	Jadadevi ...	Udayagiri ..	Nellore
3	S.I.I. IV.	1222	Bayyana ...	1050	—	—	Guntur
4	Do.	1243	Saubhagyadeva ...	1050	—	—	do.
4a	Do.	1170	Bhimanayaka ...	1061	Draksharama	Ramachandra-pur.	Godavari
5	S.I.I. VI.	160	Mahamandalika Bhimanayaka ...	1052	—	—	Guntur
6	S.I.I. VI.	1222	S. M. Bhiragatta Bayyaraja ...	1054	—	—	do.
7	N.D.I. I.	D. 48	S. M. Vijayadityadeva Maharaja ...	1079	—	Darsi ..	Nellore
8	Do.	D. 69	S. M. Abhideva Maliraja ...	1140	—	do.	do
9	Do.	Kr. 61	Allada Suddhadeva Maharaja ...	1180	—	Kandukur ...	do
10	Do.	Kr. 62	Anduluru Madhusudana deva ...	1181	—	do.	do.
11	Do.	Kr. 63	Vijadeva ...	1188	—	do.	do.
12	S.I.I. VI.	588	Allada Pemmayadeva Maharaja ...	1186	—	—	Guntur
13	N.D.I. II.	Kn. 24	Immadideva Maharaja ...	1190	Nalajanam-padu ...	Kanigiri ...	Nellore
14	L.R.	14, p. 458	Bilpuri Bijjana ...	1104	Pushpagiri ...	Cudappah ...	Cudappah

D—*Table showing the inscriptions, the donors of which claim to be the decendants of the receipients of some land or territory from Mukkanti Kaduvetti or Trilochana Pallava.*

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Dynasty or family.	Name of the King to whose reign the inscription belongs.	Village.	Taluk.	District.	Date : Saka year.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Mackenzie Mss.	Vol. II p. 770.	Durjayas of Giripaschima.	The name of the donor of the long inscription is lost.	Mudanur.	Masulipatam.	Kristna.	About S.1060.	According to the inscription, Budha I was a servant of Trilochana, king of Kanchi. For services rendered, he was given the province of Giripaschima and Konakandravadi, Buddha II was the subordinate of a Chalukya king who must beKubjavishnu
2	S. I.I.	VI. 103.	do. ...	Panda, a descendant Buddha I.	Chebrolu.	Bapatla.	Guntur.	S. 1067.	Buddha I obtained the Three Margas of Ongeru by serving the fierce Trilochana Pallava, king of Kanchi.

D.—*Table showing the inscriptions, the donors of which claim to be the descendants of the recipients of some land or territory from Mukkanti Kaduvetti or Trilochana Pallava.*—(contd.)

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Dynasty or family.	Name of the King to whose reign the inscription belongs.	Village.	Taluk.	District.	Date: Saka year.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3	S. I.I.	IV. 1182	Chodas of Velnadu.	—	—	—	—	S. 1072.	According to this inscription Mallabhupa obtained the 6,000 country to the south of the Krishna by helping Trilochana Pallava.
4	S. I.I.	VI. 224	Kota	Keta	Amaravati.	Sattenapalle.	Guntur.	S. 1104.	It is said that the 6,000 country to the south of the Krishna was given to the Kotas by Trilochana Pallava.
5	S. I.I.	VI. 620	—	Annanamatya, descendant of Rudrabhatta.	Konidena.	—	do.	About S.1070.	The donor was a descendant of Rudrabhatta of Abichchatra who migrated to the south, and obtained the agrahara of Vangipura from Mukkanti. His descendant Surya-

									bhatta obtained the village of Maratur in Rattabhûtala from Satyasraya. Kuppanarya, his brother obtained Kranza as an agrahara from Kubjavishnu.
6	S. I.I.	VI. 211	—	Muppana Nayaka, a subordinate of Gonka of Velnadu.	Tsandavolu.	Repalle.	Guntur.	S. 1092.	The donor of the grant tells us that his ancestors who were members of the fourth caste were brought from Ahichchatra along with the Brahmans by Mukkanti Kaduvetti, and were settled in the country to the north-east of the Sriparvata.
7	S.I.I.	IV. 927	—	Somana Preggada, minister of Mandabhupa, Lord of Giripaschimadesa.	Irlapadu.	Narsaraopet Taluk.	do.	S. 1057.	The donor was a descendant of Vennayabhatta Somayaji, a great pandit who lived at the court of Trinayana Pallava. This Vennayabhatta appears to be the same person as Visnubhatta Somayaji who figures so prominently in Eas-

D—*Table showing the inscriptions, the donors of which claim to be the decendants of the recipients of some land or territory from Mukkanti Kaduvetti or Trilochana Pallava*—(contd.)

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Dynasty or family.	Name of the King to whose reign the inscription belongs.	Village.	Taluk.	District.	Date : Saka year.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
									tern Chalukya grants. On one occasion, he defeated in a discussion a certain Gaudabhatta, in the presence of Trilochana Pallava, and pleased him greatly. Thereupon, Trilochana granted him the village of Mirralura in Giripaschima country.

E.—*Table showing the inscriptions in which the Karikala–Trilochana synchronism is mentioned.*

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Name of the King.	Village.	Taluk and District.	Date: Saka Year.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Re. Ep. 1921	392 of 1920	Mahamandalesvara Chiddana Choda-Maharaja.	Donekallu	Sindavadi	981
2	S.I.I. VI.	139	S. M. Pinamallideva Choda Maharaja ...	Bapatla	Bapatla, Guntur	945
3	L.R.	Vol. 22	S. M. Kamachola Maharaja	Pottapi	Cudappah	1001
4	S.I.I. VI.	651	S. M. Nanni Choda, Kannar Choda, Chodadeva Choda.	Boppudi	Guntur	1009
5	Nellore Dist. Inscriptions.	III, O. 128	S. M.......... Chuda Deva	Ramakuru	do.	1040
6	S.I.I. IV.	1328	S. M. Kannaradeva Choda Maharaja	Draksharam	Godavari	1044
7	S.I.I. VI.	606	S. M. Kamachoda Maharaja	Konidena	Guntur	1059
7-a	S.I.I. VI.	624	S. M. Tribhuvanamalla Pottapichoda ...	do.	do.	1064
8	Nellore Dt. In.	I. D. 48	S. M. Ballichoda Maharaja	Mannepalli	Nellore	1067
9	S.I.I. VI.	608	S. M. Tribhuvanamalladeva Maharaja ...	Konidena	Guntur	1069
10	S.I.I VI.	648	do. ...	do.	do.	1069
11	Nellore Dt. In.	T. D. 68	S. M. Ballaya Choda Maharaja	Sivaramapuram	Nellore	1069
12	S.I.I. VI.	610	S. M Tribhuvanamalla Choda Maharaja ...	Konidena	Guntur	1070
13	do.	647	Kamadevi, queen of the above	do.	do.	1070
14	do.	163	Tribhuvanamalla Choda Maharaja	Bapatla	do.	1072
14-a	do.	646	S. M. Nannichoda Maharaja	Konidena	do.	1073
15	Nellore Dt. In.	II. O. 19	S. M. Tribhuvanamalla Choda..	Bollavarapupadu	do.	1075
16	S I.I. VI.	153	Chikki Choda Maharaja	Bapatla	do.	1078
17	L.R.	Vol. 22	Bhujabalavira Nallasiddha Deva Choda Maharaja.	Kurukuntapalli	Cudappah	1081
18	S.I.I. VI.	645	S. M. Nannichoda Maharaja	Konidena	Guntur	1081
19	S.I I. VI.	174	Choda Balla	Bapatla	do.	1084
20	Nellore Dt. In.	I. D. 49	Ballaya Choda	Mannepalli	Nellore	1088

No.	Source.	Rd. No.	Name of the King.	Village.	Taluk and District.	Date: Saka Year.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	do.	II. O. 90	S. M. Kamana Choda Maharaja	Nannuru	Guntur	1109
22	do.	II. R. 47	Vira Kalattideva Choda Maharaja	Palicherlapadu	Nellore	1133
23	do.	II. K. 13	Manuma Siddhideva Choda Maharaja	Dubaguuta	do.	1186
24	L R.	Vol. 22.	S. M. Tirukaltideva Choda Maharaja	Pattapuravi	Cudappah	1186
25	do.	..	do.	do.	do.	Nil
26	Nellore Dt. In.	II. R. 86	A servant of Nallasiddhanadeva Choda Maharaja.	Kompedu	Nellore	1139
27	do.	II. R. 87	A servant of the subordinate of Erra Siddhi Chodadeva Maharaja.	Koturupalli	do.	Nil
28	do.	I. At. 88	A servant of the feudatory of Erra Siddhi Chodadeva Maharaja.	Mahimalur	do.	1139
29	S.I.I. VI.	628	S. M. Oppili Siddhi	Konidena	Guntur	1146
30	L.R.	22	S. M. Bhujabalavira Tirukaltideva Choda Maharaja.	Madduletigadda	Cudappah	1153
31	do.	..	S.M Gandagopala Tirukaltideva Choda Maharaja.	Voguru	do.	1153
32	Nellore Dt. In.	II. U. 8	Bhujabaladeva Tirukaltideva Maharaja	Ayyavaripalli	Nellore	1167
33	do.	II. U. 14	do.	Nandipadu	do.	1168
34	do.	I. D. 28	S. M. Harideva Choda	Gangavaram	Nellore	1176
35	do.	II. Kn. 11	Potayachodaya Maharaja	Kambhampadu	do.	1176
36	L.R.	Vol. 22.	S. M. Tirukaltideva	Kottur	Cudappah	1176
37	Nellore Dt. In.	I. D. 24	S. M. Singayadeva Gadideva	Edururallapadu	Nellore	1189
38	S.I.I. IV.	661	Bhujabalavira Manuma Gandagopaladeva Choda.	do.	Narasaraopet, Guntur	1219
39	L.R.	..	S. M. Vikrama Kusastri.	Pottapi	Cudappah	About 980
40	The Bharati.	Vol. VI. p.p. 85–91	Choda Maharaja.	Pulavarti	Guntur	About 1100 A.D.

F.—List of inscriptions referring to Mukkanti Kaduvetti or Trilochana Pallava chronologically arranged.

No.	Reference.	Donor or the King in whose reign the grant is made.	Dynasty.	Place.		Year.
				Village.	District.	
1	Nellore District Inscriptions Vol. 1 D. 2	Vikramaditya I ...	Chalukya (Badami)	Annavaram	Nellore	About S. 582 or A. D 660
2	S.I.I. VI. No. 561	Diliparasa ...	Nolamba (Pallava)	Hemavati	Anantapur	S. 864
3	S.I.I. VI. No. 189	Pina-Malli Choda Maharaja ...	Telugu Choda	Bapatla	Guntur	S. 945
4	Re. Epi. 1921. 392 of 1920	Chiddana Choda Maharaja ...	do.	Donekallu	Bellary	S. 981
5	Local Records Vol.22	Vikrama Kusa Stri Chodamaharaja.	do.	Pottapi	Cudappah	About S. 981
6	do.	Kama Choda Maharaja ...	do.	do.	do.	S. 1001
7	S.I.I. VI.	Nanni Choda, Kannara Choda, Chodadeva Choda.	do.	Boppudi	Guntur	S. 1009
8	Nel. Dis. Ins. II U. 6	Nandivarma Maharaja ...	Pallava	Jadadevi	Nellore	S. 1024
9	do. III. O. 128	...... Chuda Deva ...	Telugu Choda	Ramakuru	Guntur	S. 1040
10	S.I.I VI. No. 1828	Kannar Deva Choda Maharaja...	do.	Draksharam	Godavari	S. 1044
11	do. No. 1222	Bayyana ...	Pallava	—	Guntur	S. 1050
12	do. No. 1248	Saubhagya Deva ...	do.	—	do.	S. 1050
13	do. No. 1170	Bhimanayaka ...	do.	Draksharama	Godavari	S. 1051
14	do. VI. No. 160	do. ...	do.	—	do.	S. 1052
15	do. No. 1222	Bhiragatta Bayyaraja ...	do.	—	do.	S. 1054
16	S.I.I IV. No. 927	Somana Preggada of the time of Manda of Giripaschima.	—	Irlapadu	Guntur	S. 1057
17	do. VI. No. 606	Kamachoda Maharaja ...	Telugu Choda	Konidena	do.	S. 1059
18	Mackenzie Mss. II p. 770	Name of the donor lost ...	Durjaya	Mudanur	Krishna	About S-1060
19	S.I.I. VI. No. 624	Tribhuvanamalla Pottapi Choda.	Telugu Choda	Konidena	Guntur	Klai 4064

No.	Reference.	Donor or the King in whose reign the grant is made.	Dynasty.	Place, Village.	Place, District.	Year.
20	do. No. 103	Panda, a descendant of Buddha I.	Durjayas of Giri-paschima.	Bapatla	Guntur	S. 1067
21	Nel. Dt. In. I. D. 48	Ballichoda Maharaja ...	Telugu Choda	Mannepalli	Nellore	S 1067
22	S.I.I. VI No. 608	Tribhuvana Malladeva Maharaja.	do.	Konidena	Guntur	S. 1069
23	do. No. 648	do. ...	do.	do.	do.	S. 1069
24	Nel. Dist. In. I D 69	Ballaya Choda Maharaja ...	do.	Sivarampuram.	Nellore	S. 1069
25	S I I. VI No. 610	Tribhuvanamalla Choda Maharaja.	do.	Konidena	Guntur	S. 1070
26	do. No. 647	Kamadevi, Queen of the above...	do.	do.	do.	S. 1070
27	do. No. 620	Annanamatya ...		do.	do.	About S.1070
28	do. IV No. 1182	do. ...	Velnadu Chiefs			S. 1072
29	do. VI No. 163	Tribhuvanamalla Choda Maharaja.	Telugu Choda	Bapatla	Guntur	S. 1072
30	do. No. 646	Nanni Choda Maharaja ...	do.	Konidena	do.	S. 1073
31	Nel. Dist. In. I. D 48	Tribhuvana malla Choda Maharaja.	do.	Ballavarappadu	Nellore	S. 1075
32	S.I.I. VI No. 158	Chikki Choda Maharaja ...	do.	Bapatla	Guntur	S. 1078
33	Nel. Dist. In. I. D 43	Vijayadityadeva Maharaja ...	Pallava	—	Nellore	S. 1079
34	L.R. Vol. 22	Bhujabalavira Nallsiddhadeva Choda Maharaja.	Telugu Choda	Kurukuntapalli	Cudappah	S. 1081
35	S.I I. VI No. 645	Nanni Choda Maharaja ...	do.	Konidena	Guntur	S. 1081
36	do. No. 174	Choda Balla ...	do.	Bapatla	do.	S. 1084
37	Nel. Dist. In. I D 49	Ballaya Choda ...	do.	Mannepalli	Nellore	S. 1088
38	S.I.I. VI No. 211	Muppananayaka ...	Chalukya (Vengi)	Tsandavolu	Guntur	S. 1092
39	Andhra Bharati : 1913 (vol. 8 No. 12)	Malla Vishnuvardhana ...	Telugu Chôda	Erarupalli	Krishna	S. 1101
40	Nel. Dis. In. II O. 90	Kâmana Choda Maharaja ...	do.	Nannuru	Guntur	S. 1109
41	do. II R. 47	Vira Kâltideva Chôda Mahârâja.	do.	Pahcherlapadu	Nellore	S. 1133

42	do. II K. 18	Manma Siddadeva Chôda Mahârâja.	do.	Dubagunta	do.	S. 1136
43	L.R. vol. 22	Tirukâlti Deva Chôda Maharaja	do.	Pattapuravi	Cudappah	S. 1136
44	do.	do. ...	do.	do.	do.	nil.
45	Nell. Dis. In. II R. 86	Nalla Siddhana Deva Chôda Maharaja.	do.	Kâmpêdu	Nellore	S. 1139
46	do. R. 87	Erra Siddi Chôda Maharaja ...	do. ...	Koturupalli	do.	S. nil.
47	do. I. A. 88	do. ...	Pallava ...	Mahimalur	do.	S. 1139
48	do. I. D. 69	Abhideva Mali Raja ...	Telugu Chôda ...	...	Nellore	S. 1140
49	S.I.I. VI No. 628.	Oppili Siddhi ...	do. ...	Konidena	Guntur	S. 1146
50	L.R. vol. 42, p. 841	do. ...	do. ...	Pulavarti	do.	about S. 1150
51	L.R. vol, 22	Bhujabalavira Tirukalti Deva ...	do. ...	Madduleti-gadda	Cudappah	S. 1153
52	do.	Gandagopola Tirukalti Deva ...	do. ...	Voguru	do.	S. 1153
53	Nell. Dis.In. II, U. 3	Bhujabalavira Tirukalti Deva ...	do. ...	Ayyavaripalli	Nellore	S. 1167
54	do. II, U. 14	do. ...	do. ...	Nandipadu	do.	S. 1168
55	do. I, D. 28	Harideva Chôda ...	do. ...	Gangavaram	do.	S. 1176
56	do. II. Kn. 11	Potayachodoya Maharaja ...	do. ...	Kambham-padu.	do.	S. 1176
57	L.R. vol. 22	Tirukalti Deva ...	do. ...	Kottur	Cudappah	S. 1176
58	Re. Ep 1908, 580/07	Manumasiddha II ...	Telugu Choda ...	Nandalur	do.	S. 1179
59	Nell. Dis. In. II. Kr. 61	Allada Suddhadeva Maharaja —	Pallava ...	do.	Nellore	S. 1180
60	do. Kr. 62	Anduluru Madhusûdanadeva ...	do. ...	do.	do.	S. 1181
61	do. Kr. 63	Vija Deva ...	do. ...	do.	do.	S. 1183
62	S.I.I. VI No. 688	Allada Pemmayadeva Maharaja.	do. ...	do.	Guntur	S. 1186
63	Nell. Dis. In. I D. 24	Singayadeva Gadideva ...	Telugu Chôda ...	Edururalla-padu	Nellore	S. 1189
64	do. II. Kn. 24	Immadideva Maharaja ...	Pallava ...	Nalajanam-padu	do.	S. 1190
65	S.I.I. IV No. 661	Bhujabalavira Manuma Ganda-gopala Deva.	Telugu Chôda ...	do.	Guntur	S. 1219

APPENDIX.

No.	Reference.	Donor or the King in whose reigu the grant is made.	Dynasty.	Place.		Year.
				Village.	District.	
39-A	L.R. vol. 14, p. 458	Bilpuri Bijjana ...	Pallava ...	Pushpagiri	Cudappah	S. 1104
39-B	S.I.I. VI No. 224	Keta ...	Kôta ...	Amaravati	Guntur	S. 1104
40-B	L.R. vol. 42	Ganapati ...	Kakatiya ...	Idupulapadu	do.	S. 1131
40-A	S.I.I. VI No. 228	Keta ...	Kôta ...	Amaravati	do.	S. 1191
40-C	The Bharati	(?) ...	Telugu Chôda ...	Pulavarti	do.	(?)

Printed at the 'Vavilla' Press, Madras.